the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Algernon Blair, his heirs or personal representatives, against the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 2410). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3833. A bill for the relief of Viola McKinney; with amendments (Rept. No. 2411). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4341. A bill for the relief of James B. McGoldrick; without amendment (Rept. No. 2412). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4375. A bill for the relief of Charles Martin; with amendments (Rept. No. 2413). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4686. A bill for the relief of the estate of Harry Wright; with amendments (Rept. No. 2414). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4947. A bill for the relief of Ethel Guenther; with amendments (Rept. No. 2415). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5198. A bill for the relief of Marjorie B. Marable; with amendments (Rept. No. 2416). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5261. A bill for the relief of David Weiss, with amendments (Rept. No. 2417). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5372. A bill for the relief of Jessie Wolfington; with amendments (Rept. No. 2418). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5414. A bill for the relief of Marie Gorak; with amendments (Rept. No. 2419). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5725. A bill for the relief of Sadie Frey and the estate of Marie Hviding; with amendments (Rept. No. 2420). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6248. A bill for the relief of Capital Office Equipment Co.; with amendments (Rept. No. 2421). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6307. A bill for the relief of Francesco D'Emilio; without amendment (Rept. No. 2422). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 6909. A bill authorizing the appointment of three additional judges of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, prescribing the qualifications of appointees to the municipal court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 6910. A bill relating to the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange sites at Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, Fla., for Coast Guard purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina:

H. R. 6911. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 6912. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 6913. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 6914 A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 6915. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 6916. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 6917. A bill to provide for site acquisition and design of Federal buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 6918. A bill to provide emergency relief for the victims of the seismic waves which struck the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. DAUGHTON of Virginia:

H. R. 6919. A bill relating to the display, along with the flag of the United States of America, of flags, banners, and pennants of certain organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 6920. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

H. R. 6921. A bill to amend section 7 (c) of the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PFEIFER:

H. R. 6922. A bill to establish a Department of Health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 6923. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, so as to exempt World War II veterans from liability for further training and service in the armed forces of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 6924. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act so as to provide insurance for certain crops planted for harvest in 1947; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 6925. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act so as to provide for the United States to pay 25 percent of insurance premiums; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAUGHTON of Virginia:

H. R. 6926. A bill for the relief of George W. Whitehurst; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 6927. A bill for the relief of Paul C. Juneau; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 6928. A bill for the relief of Dudley Tarver; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEWART:

H. R. 6929. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mildred H. Gibbons, Chief Clerk, Hugo, Okla., Farm Security Administration, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. R. 6930. A bill for the relief of John Bettencourt, surviving husband of Leona Bettencourt; and for the relief of Nancy Kathleen Bettencourt, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2043. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution of William B. Mawhinney Memorial Post, No. 1593, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Hawthorne, N. J., calling for the deportation of alien enemy persons interned for subversive activities; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2044. By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of City Council of the city of Chicago, for dredging an 18-foot channel for North Branch of the Chicago River between North Avenue and Belmont Avenue; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2045. By Mr. ROWAN: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fourth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, regarding freedom of those who labor; to the Committee on Labor.

2046. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Berry Campbell, Minneapolis, Minn., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the McMahon atomic energy control bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2047. Also, petition of Francis Jean Reuter, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to case, Air Corps against Francis Jean Reuter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

SATURDAY, JUNE 29, 1946

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 5, 1946)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Father of mankind, to whom all souls are dear and whose tender mercies are over all Thy works, as we come our grateful hearts are singing, "This is the day the Lord has made; therefore we will rejoice and be glad in it." Turning to this morning garden of silence from a world so full of tumult and passion, setting our faces toward waiting tasks, we pray for guidance and for strength. Save us, we beseech Thee, from all error, pride, and prejudice. Grant us that candor which is the high courage of the soul. Help us to find in each problem and perplexity but the prelude to those larger understandings which in a desert of denials and betrayals of truth and freedom shall

be as trees planted for the healing of the nations. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, June 28, 1946, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6885) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, to provide appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 151. Concurrent resolution against adoption of reorganization plan No. 2 of May 16, 1946;

H. Con. Res. 154. Concurrent resolution against adoption of reorganization plan No. 3 of May 16, 1946; and

H. Con. Res. 155. Concurrent resolution against adoption of reorganization plan No. 1 of May 16, 1946.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on June 29, 1946, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2341) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

REPORT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 7999.)

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Capper	Green
Andrews	Carville	Guffey
Ball	Chavez	Gurney
Barkley	Donnell	Hart
Bridges	Downey	Hayden
Brooks	Ferguson	Hill
Burch	Fulbright	Hoey
Bushfield	George	Huffman
Byrd	Gerry	Johnson, Colo.
Capehart	Gossett	Johnston, S. C.
Kilgore	Murdock	Swift
Knowland	Myers	Taft
La Follette	O'Daniel	Taylor
Lucas	O'Mahoney	Thomas, Okla.
McCarran	Overton	Tobey
McClellan	Pepper	Tunnell
McKellar	Radcliffe	Wagner
McMahon	Reed	Wherry
Magnuson	Revercomb	White
Mead	Robertson	Wiley
Millikin	Russell	Willis
Mitchell	Smith	Wilson
Moore	Stanfill	Young
Morse	Stewart	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is necessarily absent.

The Senators from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO and Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent on official business, having been appointed a member of the President's Evaluation Commission in connection with the test of atomic bombs on naval vessels at Bikini.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business, having been appointed to the commission on the part of the Senate to participate in the Philippine independence ceremonies.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is absent on official business, having been appointed a member of the President's Evaluation Commission in connection with the test of atomic bombs on naval vessels at Bikini.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent by leave of the Senate, being a member of a committee designated by the Senate to attend the atomic bombing at Bikini.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a member of the Special Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are absent on official business, being members of the Commission appointed to attend the Philippine independence ceremonies.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Seventy-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

FULL AND COMPLETE CITIZENSHIP FOR THE AMERICAN INDIAN

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the American Legion, Department of South Dakota, in convention assembled on June 18, 1946, favoring full and complete citizenship for the American Indian.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

From the time of the discovery of this country the American Indian has been subject to abuse and unjust discrimination, the nature of which is common knowledge to all.

Whereas by his courage and loyalty to his country, the American Indian has demonstrated in both World Wars by actual combat that he is deserving of the admiration of his fellow countrymen; and

Whereas according to official records, more Indians volunteered their services in their country's behalf on a proportionate basis, population considered, than any other group of our citizens; and

Whereas there remains in evidence in this State as well as in other States, unjust discrimination tending to bar returning veterans of the last war from attending social functions and similar privileges accorded their white comrades with whom they served in the fox holes and beachheads of Europe and in the southwest Pacific; to rectify this gross injustice: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Department of South Dakota, the American Legion, in convention assembled on this 18th day of June A. D. 1946, do petition our Government to grant the American Indian full and complete citizenship, including the right of voting, conducting his personal affairs in a manner now exercised by persons of other races; be it further

Resolved, That a copy thereof be sent to each of the four Members of the South Dakota delegation in Congress, and that the national committeeman of the South Dakota Department of the American Legion be instructed to contact the National committeemen of the American Legion representing States having considerable Indian population to the end that proper and suitable legislation be enacted by Congress which will provide the rights and privileges sought herein.

INDIAN RIGHTS

Recommend that funds and loans ordinarily made available to veterans under the GI bill be made more surely available to Indian veterans through the Indian administration or any other governmental agency existing or created for that purpose. This followed discussion revealing that GI loans to Indians on reservations are tossed back and forth between loaning agencies and the Indian Office with neither willing to push them through.

Further recommend that Indian veterans be accorded full rights of citizenship and the social privileges accorded other veterans.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCARRAN (for himself and Mr. MURDOCK):

S. 2394. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to make withdrawals of public lands in certain cases," approved June 25, 1910, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2395. A bill to establish the National Elks Scenic Area and Park in the San Juan Range of the Rocky Mountains in Colorado; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 6885) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, to provide appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

WOMEN IN POLITICS—ARTICLE BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Wanted: More Politics in Women," written by him and published in the August 1946 issue of She, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CHEESE AND DAIRY INDUSTRY OF WISCONSIN

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Bring Your Own Crackers," written by Phil Drotning, and published in the July 1946 issue of the magazine Holiday, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY FORMER PRESIDENT HERBERT HOOVER ON WORLD FAMINE

[Mr. SMITH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by former President Herbert Hoover on the subject of world famine, at the invitation of the Canadian Government, at Ottawa, Canada, on June 28, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

DIVERSION OF WATER FROM LAKE MICHIGAN BY CITY OF CHICAGO—EDITORIAL FROM MONTREAL STAR

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Another Chicago Steal?" published in the Montreal Daily Star of June 12, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

INEQUITIES IN DISCHARGE PROCEDURE IN THE NAVY—LETTER TO CHIEF, BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL FROM RAY S. BROGDON

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated February 27, 1946, from Ray S. Brogdon to Vice Adm. L. E. Denfeld, Chief, Bureau of Naval Personnel, Washington, D. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNION FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION—STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "The Foreign Policy of the Union for Democratic Action," which appears in the Appendix.]

ACQUISITION OF NON-FEDERAL PROPERTY WITHIN GLACIER NATIONAL PARK—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 230)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Chief Clerk, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith without my approval the bill (S. 1273) to provide for the acquisition by exchange of non-Federal property within the Glacier National Park.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to accept title to any non-Federal property within the boundaries of the Glacier National Park when the acquisition by exchange of such property would in his judgment be in the best interest of the United States. In exchange for the non-Federal property so to be acquired the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey to the grantors of such property, or to their nominees, any federally owned property within the Glacier National Park which is of approximate equal value to the property being acquired.

I am in accord with the general purposes and objectives of the measure. Section 2 of the bill, however, provides that title to all lands, interests in lands, buildings or other property acquired pursuant to the act shall be satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior. This provision is highly objectionable and represents a material change in existing law involving an unwarranted deviation from the long-established and manifestly sound practice under which the Attorney General is charged with the duty of examining the validity of titles to lands acquired by the Government. This duty has for more than a century been vested in the Attorney General with respect to the vast majority of acquisitions and I perceive no reason to change this general practice which has proven so satisfactory through the years.

An advantage of this long-standing policy has been that the agency of the Government acquiring the land has the independent checking of the title by a disinterested agency. Moreover, there can be no question that the maintenance in the different departments of the Government of large staffs of attorneys for the purpose of examining title to land will result in duplication, additional expense, as well as less efficient administration. It is to avoid duplication of this character that the Congress passed and I approved the Reorganization Act of 1945.

For these reasons, I am constrained to withhold my approval from the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 28, 1946.*

APPROPRIATIONS FOR GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES, 1947

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 6777) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, yesterday, at the direction of the committee, I offered an amendment, which is section 306, and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] felt that the amendment should be amended. If they have reached an agreement in that respect I wish they would suggest it.

Mr. TAFT. I had said I felt compelled to make a point of order against the amendment, and insisted upon the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order has been sustained.

Mr. TAFT. In lieu of the committee amendment, I therefore offer two amendments dealing with the whole subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 20, line 16, after the colon, it is proposed to insert:

The types of programs set forth in the 1947 budget of the Commodity Credit Corporation, within the funds available to it are approved but the subsidy program shall be subject to the provisions of H. R. 6042.

On page 8, line 14, at the end of the paragraph, it is proposed to insert:

Provided further, That the subsidy program shall be subject to the provisions of H. R. 6042.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I shall explain the first amendment. The amendment is on page 20, after the colon in line 16, to insert:

The types of programs set forth in the 1947 budget of the Commodity Credit Corporation, within the funds available to it are approved but the subsidy program shall be subject to the provisions of H. R. 6042.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. House bill 6042 has become a law, has it not?

Mr. TAFT. House bill 6042 has just been vetoed by the President. However, I know of no way to frame the amendment except to refer to House bill 6042 as such for the present. Whether it will become law or not I do not know. If it does not become law, it will be necessary, I think, to pass some other general subsidy legislation. So that for the present I think all we can do is to refer to that bill. It is still in a state of suspended animation.

Mr. FERGUSON. The RECORD will at least show what we are talking about.

Mr. McKELLAR. It will not do any harm to make reference to the bill.

Mr. TAFT. I may explain, Mr. President, that the Byrd-Butler law provides that every corporation must submit a budget, but "the budget program shall be a business-type budget, or plan of operations, with due allowance given to the need for flexibility, including provision for emergencies and contingencies, in order that the corporation may properly carry out its activities as authorized by law. The budget program shall con-

tain estimates of the financial condition and operations of the corporation for the current and ensuing fiscal years and the actual condition and results of operation for the last completed fiscal year."

The budget program shall then be submitted by the President to Congress, and it is provided that "the budget programs transmitted by the President to the Congress shall be considered, and if necessary, legislation shall be enacted making available such funds or other financial resources as the Congress may determine."

The idea was that the Government corporations should set out the general scope of their activities, realizing that we could not hold them down, that we did not know exactly how they may operate.

The Commodity Credit Corporation, in the Budget for the year 1947, has submitted a budget which provides for its major activities, including the supply program, the foreign purchase program, the price support program, the commodity export program, and the subsidy program.

Those items are set out in fairly general terms, and the language which we here propose to adopt provides the general program which they have set forth. That was the only purpose of the Byrd-Butler Act. It was that they could not suddenly develop a brand new program with funds which conceivably might be authorized by some law, or that some law might be stretched to authorize, without having given any notice to Congress. So what we do in this amendment is simply to use the language suggested by the Commodity Credit Corporation itself in the Budget message, that the types of program set forth in the 1947 budget of the Commodity Credit Corporation, within the funds available to it, are approved.

I think that carries out the purpose of the act and gives leeway for every activity of the Commodity Credit Corporation, except something brand new that no one ever heard of. Such an activity could not be engaged in without the approval of Congress.

The last proviso, that the subsidy program shall be subject to the provisions of House bill 6402, I think is necessary, because that bill contains rather specific figures on subsidies. Those figures and the RFC figures total about $2,000,000,000. We have just passed a bill which limits subsidies to $1,000,000,000. I presume that the amount will be still lower than that if the bill does not become a law. I think we should make it clear, in order to resolve the conflict, that this program should be subject to the provisions of the subsidy program which was worked out so carefully. So, Mr. President, I offer the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer the second amendment, which deals with the RFC, on page 8, line 14, adding at the end of the paragraph the words: *"Provided further,* That the subsidy program shall be subject to the provisions of H. R. 6402."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the second amendment is agreed to.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I was not present when this bill was taken up. There is an item in the bill of $3,000,000 to build a fertilizer factory. With as many defunct fertilizer factories as there are in the United States, as poor an industry as it is from the standpoint of earning capacity, I wish to place in the RECORD, at least for conference purposes, a brief statement. It had been my purpose to move to reconsider this amendment. I read the following telegram:

> Reported Senate Appropriations Committee has inserted in the corporations appropriations bill an item of $3,000,000 for TVA to build fertilizer plant at Mobile. This item has been rejected several times by the House and is reportedly not approved by the Budget. Mobile geographically not in TVA territory. Even if it were it would be outrageous for the Government to go into direct competition with fertilizer industry who are doing business and paying all forms of taxes both to the State and the Government for their support. * * * The Government can not run without taxes from private business and individuals. If they continue to go into competition from day to day with industry they deprive the Government of taxes and they will ultimately be without sufficient revenue with which to run.

Why it is necessary for the Government to build a fertilizer factory within TVA territory, or without TVA territory, passes my understanding. Anyone familiar with the fertilizer industry knows that it has been a low-earning industry for many years. Anyone knows that most of the fertilizer factories in this country have either got into great difficulty or have gone broke; and yet there is an effort to put the Government into an industry of this kind in competition with the enterprises which are trying to operate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I should like to state why the committee put the item in the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Let me ask the Senator if it was approved by the Budget Bureau.

Mr. McKELLAR. No.

Mr. GEORGE. It was not recommended by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; it was not. The reason why it was put in is that the evidence produced by Mr. O'Neal and others representing the American Farm Bureau Federation showed that there was a shortage of fertilizers, and had been a shortage for quite a while. This does not put the Government into the fertilizer business. It extends the Government's fertilizer business. As we all know, the Government has a large fertilizer plant at Muscle Shoals. This item simply adds a plant at Mobile, which is very close to the largest supply of phosphates that we now have, in Florida. The supply is even larger than the supply of phosphates in Tennessee. For that reason it was proposed to place the plant at Mobile, Ala. Mr. O'Neal, of the Farm Bureau Federation, appeared before the committee. He was greatly interested in the project. As we all know, this is one of the things in which the late Senator Bankhead took a very active interest. He succeeded in having the Senate approve the project on three occasions. The House has refused it each time, but the Senate has already approved it three times, and we felt that it should be recommended and approved this time. That is why the committee reported it.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I dislike to take issue with the Appropriations Committee, but I should like to make this statement in all kindness: The Appropriations Committee is exercising a very wide jurisdiction in the field of general legislation. It is not fair to the Senate. It is not fair to the Congress. It is not fair to the country to have this kind of thing going on. This is legislation, and if it were approved by the House an appropriation might be made for the project.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is true that during the war many items of legislation have been added to appropriation bills. I think that practice reached the limit during the war. It has been very materially decreased lately. I think it ought to be further decreased. I do not believe that we ought to legislate on appropriation bills if it is possible to avoid it. Whenever it has been done, it has been by unanimous consent, because any legislation on an appropriation bill is subject to a point of order. That has never been better illustrated than in connection with this bill. Yesterday, by direction of the committee, I offered an amendment which was subject to a point of order, and two Senators made the point of order. The amendment went out. On the other hand, the substance of what was proposed by that amendment, which was subject to a point of order, was offered a few moments ago by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and unanimously accepted. That is the way it has been done. It has been done by unanimous consent. I think there is too much legislation on appropriation bills. However, the practice is very carefully guarded. It can be done only by unanimous consent.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am not quarreling with my distinguished friend from Tennessee; but what happens is that the Appropriations Committee reports all sorts of legislative proposals. We must do something about them, so we get together, and in lieu of what has been brought in we adopt something by unanimous consent, when nothing ought to have been brought in in the first instance.

I am advised—and I wish to make this statement before the bill is reported—that in the Labor Department appropriation bill, which will shortly be before us, the highly controversial bill to return the employment services to the States is virtually incorporated as it passed the Senate. It has not been agreed to by the House. The House has a different version of that bill. That bill is now, or

should be, in conference. If such a provision is incorporated in the Labor Department appropriation bill I shall not hesitate to oppose it to the limit.

I merely want to emphasize what I am trying to point out as to one of the greatest evils into which we have fallen. Of course when there is placed in an appropriation bill and tied up with a great many other things in which all Members are interested, an item which ought not to be in it, then it becomes necessary to crawl around and by unanimous consent get it out by some means. We are almost powerless to vote it out; we are almost powerless to eliminate it in any other way.

The Appropriations Committee has its proper important function, but its function is not to legislate; and yet I unhesitatingly say that almost every appropriation bill is filled with legislative provisions. That ought not to be, and nobody but the Senate can protect itself.

I know about the fertilizer business, coming back to that. There is a shortage of fertilizer now, and let me tell the Senator from Tennessee why there is a shortage. There is a shortage of sulfuric acid which must be used in order to make a balanced fertilizer. There is a plant at Tuscaloosa, Ala., which was used by the Government to manufacture power and which is now in a stand-by condition and fully equipped to make sulfuric acid. The only people who can operate that plant said they were willing to do it provided they would get a price on sulfuric acid that would enable them to pay the cost. They had to go to OPA to get a price. The Civilian Production Administration said, "O. K.; we are anxious to do it." They were cooperating 100 percent. The persons seeking to operate the plant went to OPA. OPA gave an even better price than they asked, but said that everything must be based f. o. b. on Copperhill, Tenn. That meant that at the other plants where the same company was producing, which plants would be nearer the consuming centers, the freight would be less, but they would have to charge the same freight to the farmers as was charged from Copperhill. Of course, no other governmental agency save the OPA would have been so indifferent to the facts and so blind to the realities as to have attached that sort of condition.

There is a shortage of fertilizer because the present factories and plants cannot be utilized, and therefore the Government must build another plant, take another taxpayer off the tax list, strip the Government more and more year by year of tax revenues, and strip the counties and the States also. If the Federal Government continues to move at the rate it is going, if the Federal Government pursues the course it is now pursuing, the time is near at hand when the great industries of this country will of necessity be federalized, because independent industries cannot compete with the Government, and we will have a system of national socialism.

OPA was appealed to. An effort was made to make plain to them what the facts were, but they still have the problem there. They have had it for some time, and in the meantime the period in which fertilizers should be used is fast elapsing. It will do no good to get fertilizer in the wintertime when the crops that ought to have the fertilizer in the southeastern section have not been able to get it. Every time a Government factory is constructed to do what private enterprise can do, and is doing, it becomes more and more necessary for the Government to do the whole job. We are simply crippling private enterprise and at the same time professing that we are believers in private enterprise. I undertake to say there is no necessity for the building by the Government of a fertilizer plant at any point in Alabama or my State.

There was some reason for the fertilizer plant which was constructed in connection with Muscle Shoals because that plant was equipped to make nitrogen; it was equipped to make certain elements of fertilizer, and it was desired that experimentation should take place and that something be done through the Government that would illustrate whether it would be possible to make fertilizer by new methods and at cheaper prices. But now in this appropriation bill there is a $3,000,000 appropriation which is not recommended by the Budget Bureau, but which the committee has simply reached out and put into it.

I suppose it would be useless to make a motion to reconsider it; but I am making these remarks so that the House committee will know that whatever they do with this item will certainly have some support in the Senate. Furthermore, I am making this statement for the purpose of letting our own Senate conferees know that when the bill comes back here, even in the form of a conference report, I may steadfastly object to it and oppose it, if it has this item in it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I am not going to offer an amendment but this bill carries a large appropriation for administrative expenses of RFC. To the RFC has been transferred the Rubber Reserve Corporation. I desire to point out to the Senate what our situation is in regard to rubber at the present moment.

During the war when the British, French, and Dutch could not defend their Pacific possessions and had great difficulty in sustaining themselves in their homelands, the American people, in their great anxiety, expended a large sum of money to create synthetic rubber plants where there could be produced more than 1,000,000 tons of synthetic rubber a year. When we, at great sacrifice of money and bloodshed, recaptured the possesions in the Pacific of the Dutch, the French, and the British, after we had given them tremendous amounts by way of lend-lease to sustain them, we had a contract with those countries to buy their raw rubber at 18½ cents a pound, but since the recapture of their possessions for them they are now asking us to pay 23½ cents a pound f. o. b. the far eastern ports. The OPA at the present moment—showing another ridiculous situation so far as that agency is concerned—will not allow a price of more than 22½ cents a pound for raw rubber in this country. This means that the American taxpayer has to absorb the difference. Under the 18½ cents purchasing price we can lay it down here at 22½ cents a pound, but under the 23½ cents a pound f. o. b. the Pacific, we will continue to lose money and let these foreign countries that we saved through lend-lease and through our sacrifice of blood and lives and through the recapture of their empire, gouge us further to the extent of over $32,000,000 a year. In that connection, I may say the British are taking the lead.

The other day there appeared in the Times-Herald an article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop outlining and stating that:

A person who was a member of then Secretary of the Treasury Vinson's original staff for handling the British proposal for a $4,400,000,000 loan discloses that Britain's claims of poverty are false, and recommends the loan be cut back accordingly.

I ask that the entire article be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BUM DEAL

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

From within the United States Treasury comes news of official discovery that the British have kidded us again, and about big money.

A person who was a member of then Secretary of the Treasury Vinson's original staff for handling the British proposal for a $4,400,000,000 "loan" discloses that Britain's claims of poverty are false, and recommends the loan be cut back, accordingly.

This analysis has been furnished to top governmental authorities. It is so important that we reprint it here in full without attempting to translate. It's plain enough, anyhow. Here it is, dated June 19:

"The British loan should be re-examined and cut down to size.

"Actual trade developments since VE-day—as distinguished from the guesstimates made by those responsible for negotiating the loan—now demonstrate that the British do not need anything like the sum agreed on by the negotiators.

"As of last August, the British claimed that in the first year following VE-day they would incur a balance of payments deficit of three billions and in the next 2 years a further deficit of two billions.

"The British estimate for the balance of payments in the crucial first year of transition was as follows (Mr. Clayton's testimony, Senate hearings, S. J. Res. 138P118):

[In billions of dollars]

	Imports	Exports
Minimum imports, austerity level	5.2	
Commercial exports		2.6
Net balance on war expenditures	1.3	
Net balance on invisible items		.6
Total	6.5	3.2

Deficit: 3.3 billions of dollars.

"Ten months have now elapsed since VE-day and actual export and import figures are available against which to check the estimates made last August.

"British imports are actually running at a rate $1,000,000,000 less than they estimated. On the other hand, British exports are running at a rate $1,000,000,000 more than they estimated, thus reducing their estimated balance of payments deficit by $2,000,000,000.

"No information is currently available as to the actual developments with respect to the net war expenditures or the net balance

on invisible items, but both these are very probably more favorable than was estimated last August.

"Taking into account the actual flow of commodities it is perfectly clear that the balance of payments deficit in the first year after VE-day will amount not to the three and three-tenths billions assumed in August of last year, but to no more than and probably much less than one and three-tenths billions.

"This conclusion is confirmed by the British holdings of gold-and-dollar balances. During the last 10 months when the British expected a deficit in their balance of payments to cut sharply into their holdings of gold-and-dollar balances, nothing of that sort has occurred.

"According to British figures, their net holdings of gold-and-dollar balances at the end of the war amounted to $1,840,000,000. The latest figures supplied by the British show that 9 months later their net holdings were still $1,750,000,000.

"The decrease is accounted for by settlement of a Canadian account.

"It may be noted that as of April 1941 the British reported a net balance of gold-and-dollar exchange of zero.

"During the war and by reason of lend-lease and troop payments made to Americans throughout the empire their net balance of gold-and-dollar exchange increased to a level of approximately one and nine-tenths billions.

"There can be no doubt that during the war this country made a very powerful contribution to the improvement in the British gold-and-dollar-balance position.

"The loan should be referred back to committee and cut down in size.

"The figures cited above demonstrate the British balance of payments is actually very much more favorable than assumed by the administration when it negotiated the loan. If the loan was proper on the basis of the estimates made in August, it is obviously too large in the light of actual developments.

"The administration has failed to supply the committees of Congress with information showing the actual course of trade developments. This was not the only item on which they have failed to tell the whole story.

"They did not point out that Empire countries during the war enormously increased their holdings of gold and dollar balances. South Africa alone holds nine hundred millions—three times her prewar holdings. Nor did the administration indicate what it knew to be true, that the British liabilities to Empire countries would be substantially reduced.

"The British owe India four and five-tenths billion; Egypt, one and five-tenths billion; and Palestine, five hundred and fifty million. These sums, the administration has been informed, will be settled just as lend-lease was settled, at a small fraction of the nominal indebtedness.

"In the light of these considerations a cut in the British loan is clearly indicated. Indeed, there is reason to believe that quite apart from any loan or gift the British can receive all the assistance they may need in their balance of payment problem through the international fund.

"Through that fund, it may be recalled, the British can get, without any struggle at all, three hundred and fifty million every year to total one and three-tenths billion. If necessary they can, of course, receive much more than that."

There it is. Nobody in his right mind can misunderstand that memorandum. Nobody with the best interests of the United States at heart will ignore it.

The House of Representatives this week begins final consideration of that so-called loan to Britain. The memorandum quoted in full above shows as plain as day why that loan is a bum deal for the United States of America.

Instead of merely cutting it down, Congress will throw the loan out entirely if it wants to serve America first. At any rate, just remember what you read here. If the loan goes through, there will be big trouble to follow—and never let it be said that we didn't know.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I wish to say that either we should not continue to let the British gouge us on the price of rubber, or we should deny the loan. They do not need both. I believe the figures to which I refer are authentic, and indicate that the British do not need $3,750,000,000 at this time, and at the very most they would not need more than $1,300,000,000, which was the figure we discussed during the debate.

In all fairness to the American people, the Treasury, having these figures at the present time, owes it to the American people to disclose them before it succeeds in getting the other House to approve, on the basis of a completely erroneous set of facts and circumstances, a loan to a foreign country, of the size which has been approved by the Senate.

I wish to protect further the closing of the synthetic-rubber plants of this country. We need to keep those plants in running order, so that the American people may be protected for all time to come, or at least until we see some signs of honest-to-God cooperation throughout the world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6777) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. GURNEY, conferees on the part of the Senate.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 1850) to promote the progress of science and the useful arts, to secure the national defense, to advance the national health and welfare, and for other purposes.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, this is a bill which was introduced by the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. It has been referred to as the science bill. I should like to suggest that immediately after disposal of the bill the Senate take up Senate bill 1248, which is the so-called Fulbright bill. I believe that it would be well to have an understanding that both these bills be considered, because the consideration of them would point out the fact that they are two different and separate proposals.

When Senate bill 1248 was discussed by the Senate once before, there was some confusion and misunderstanding on the part of some of the Members because it was assumed at that time that the bills were interrelated, that there was much in common between them, and that the enactment of one or the other might interfere with the progress of the remaining measure. It was suggested that the enactment of both bills would result in a duplication of effort. Therefore, it occurs to me that, in view of the fact that both bills are on the calendar, and that each represents widely separated objectives and has little in common with the other, we should have the Fulbright bill taken up after we have considered and disposed of the pending measure, provided, of course, that there is sufficient time within which to do that without interfering with consideration of the appropriation bills and other important legislative matters.

Mr. President, with reference to the Fulbright bill, which differs from the Kilgore-Magnuson bill in that it relates to applied science rather than to pure basic science, which is the objective of the Kilgore-Magnuson bill, I should like to make a few observations.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Am I to understand that the Senator was asking for unanimous consent that the Fulbright bill be now considered?

Mr. MEAD. No; I was not. I was merely suggesting the possibility of the consideration of both these measures, one as quickly after the other as practicable, in order to point out the fact that they are two different and entirely separate measures. Moreover, the discussion of one might be helpful in connection with the consideration of the other in the event that the Fulbright bill is brought up not too long after the Kilgore-Magnuson bill has been disposed of.

Mr. TAFT. I want to suggest that there are many important bills on the calendar.

Mr. MEAD. When the Fulbright bill was discussed in the Senate on a prior occasion it was pointed out by a number of Senators that there was no other bill which covered the same situation. If it is understood that there are two bills on the calendar, and that they are not related one with the other, but deal with separate objectives and that we should take them up as soon as we can possibly do so, one after another, it will have a tendency to clear up the misunderstanding.

Mr. President, with reference to the Fulbright bill, Senate bill 1248, I wish to leave with the Senate the following observations:

During the war, when we needed the full strength of small business to help win the war, the Congress provided for the creation of a Smaller War Plants Corporation. I believe that the Senate is familiar with the creation, operation, and administration of that Corporation.

Prior to that time the Senate authorized the appointment of a Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises. That committee has, in my judgment, served the Senate and country well. It has been of great service to small business in bringing it into the war effort and in keeping small business in a good wholesome, healthy, and economic condition insofar as it was possible to do so.

Small business came through during the war, and now in these difficult days of reconversion we should help small business get back to peacetime production.

That is one reason for my great interest in the Fulbright bill. This bill would make the fruits of modern science available to American business; it would go far toward insuring the continued vigor of our entire national economy.

This bill is founded on the recognition that is an age of science, American business, particularly small business, will starve at the roots if it cannot make use of the fruits of science. This bill would tap, for the benefit of business, the vast store of technological information now in the possession of the Government. It would put existing Government research facilities to work in the interest of business. It would help business to make use of new inventions, new products, and new processes.

Mr. President, as the result of the strain and stress of the Nation's war effort, there are a great many new processes in a great many fields. In various fields, by reason of the shortage of materials, new provisions were made. New devices were utilized, and new practices and new procedures were inaugurated. All those new developments can be made available to the little businessman and small manufacturer, no matter where he is located, if he has available to him a central headquarters where he can secure the necessary information and service.

Mr. President, as I said, it will help business make use of these new inventions, new products, and new processes.

Under the strain of the war, many new methods and processes came into being all over the world, and many of those processes which came into being in the occupied nations are now being brought into this country. They would be available to small business if we had the particular set-up which is proposed in the Fulbright bill. Many of them would improve small business in this country and make it more efficient.

The Fulbright bill, S. 1248, presents the first real attempt at this session of Congress to help the small businessman, and also the large businessman and the medium-sized businessman, through the maze of new scientific developments which can be applied to their business. The Fulbright bill is practical; it is sound and workable. It presents no conflict with the pending bill or with any other bill, and it has developed no real opposition.

The Fulbright bill recognizes that in this age of scientific complexity only a few of the largest corporations have the research facilities necessary for national and international leadership. Dr. Condon, the new Director of the Bureau of Standards, who previously was associate director of Westinghouse laboratories, has testified that even in an organization as large as Westinghouse "the problem of adequately marshaling and bringing to bear all the available scientific and technical knowledge is extremely difficult."

If corporations as great in size as Westinghouse cannot marshal and bring to bear all the available scientific information, imagine the difficulties of the small businessman, the man without such laboratory facilities. I think it is an understatement, Mr. President, to say that the small businessman is confused and that the small businessman is handicapped. Even large corporations simply cannot afford to maintain the large laboratories and corps of technicians necessary to keep up with the pace of modern science; they often contract out their work. But work so handled is mostly inadequate and incomplete.

The Fulbright bill creates in the Department of Commerce an office of Scientific and Technical Services which will meet this problem and will be the agency of government which will collect and furnish technical information for the use of the businessman. It will not concern itself with pure science and its development. That will be taken care of by the pending bill, the so-called Kilgore-Magnuson bill. I wish to repeat that the Fulbright bill will not concern itself with pure science and its development. It will not concern itself with creative science and its activities. That is the function of the National Science Foundation which is created by the Kilgore-Magnuson bill, S. 1850, a bill which I favor, but which deals with an entirely different subject.

I wish to state definitely and categorically, Mr. President, that the Kilgore-Magnuson bill, S. 1850, is entirely different and apart from the Fulbright bill. The Fulbright bill has twice been brought up on the unanimous consent calendar in the Senate but both times it was sidetracked, due to misunderstanding and belief that it duplicated the Kilgore-Magnuson bill or dealt with the same subjects. The Kilgore-Magnuson bill, now being called up, establishes a National Science Foundation to coordinate and stimulate basic scientific research—and I stress the word basic—to be carried on by a number of Government agencies, by universities, and by private research laboratories. It will also provide scholarships and fellowships for training a larger number of young scientists. It will not concern itself in any way, in any shape, or in any form with the technical, applied, scientific problems of American businessmen.

Mr. President, during the war we developed a great deal of the lighter metals techniques. Aluminum and magnesium and lighter steel products were developed. All these techniques will be made available to the small manufacturers all over the United States if the Fulbright bill is enacted and if this agency to disseminate the information is created.

The National Science Foundation, Mr. President, which is provided for in the other bill, the Kilgore-Magnuson bill, will do no research of its own. It will operate entirely by means of research contracts. It will delegate to the Army the job of working on such new weapons as guided missiles and rocket ships. It will encourage the Navy to improve its ships and ordnance. It will foster basic research on the causes of cancer and other diseases. It will encourage and facilitate basic research which will contribute to scientific agriculture. In brief, the Kilgore-Magnuson bill will stimulate the progress of pure science and creative science in this country by research contracts and by training more young scientists.

The Fulbright bill, on the other hand, provides an entirely different program which stands on its own. It provides a program which is dependent on no other bill. It provides a program to give business the kind of practical assistance it wants and needs. It creates in the Department of Commerce an office which will be a businessman's office—an office to which the businessman can go with his technical questions. He will be able to go to the present field offices of the Department with his technical problems and he will be able to get some practical help. He will not be referred to a half dozen different agencies, as he now is. He will not be told that if he goes to Washington he may or may not find an answer.

The relation of the Fulbright bill to the National Science Foundation bill was very carefully considered by the Senate Commerce Committee, and the committee found no duplication or overlapping. This point is clearly and specifically covered in the Commerce Committee report on Senate bill 1248. It is report No. 908, and it has been available since January 29 of this year.

Mr. President, the Office of Technical and Scientific Services set up by the Fulbright bill will collect, analyze, compile, and maintain complete records and information regarding the latest scientific developments which are useful to business. Through publications and personal contacts that Office will make this information available to businessmen all over the country. For example, a small businessman in North Carolina, New York, or Nevada who needs a good metal corrosive will need only write or call on the Office or at the local Department of Commerce office and ask for the information. By return mail he will receive the information, together with all the information that is known to the Government about corrosive agents. With light metals now being used extensively in manufacturing, more and more of this information will be required, and it will be available.

The Office will also be the place where independent inventors can bring their inventions for evaluation, and at the Office, which will have adequate safeguards, they will be able to get assistance for the development of worthy inventions. One hears too many stories of inventors who have ideas who have been held up from 10 to 20 years because they had no one to whom to go who would evaluate their inventions and furnish suggestions as to where to go to get assistance in their development.

Finally, Mr. President, the Office will promote wide use in private business of the very great number of publicly owned patents which have resulted from Government research and development. The Commissioner of Patents, Casper Ooms, has testified that the bill does not involve any changes in the patent laws. It is not patent legislation, but it would make our patent system more effective. No objection to the bill has been made by the Association of Patent Attorneys.

Thus we see that the Kilgore-Magnuson bill and the Fulbright bill are entirely different bills—entirely different in purpose—entirely different in provisions—entirely different in function. Both bills are needed, but each bill stands entirely on its own merits. Neither bill depends on the passage of the other.

One thing I want specifically to mention is the fact that the Fulbright bill—to help the small businessman, and all businessmen, in their applied scientific problems—is not a revolutionary program, and is not a new program. Many of the functions under the bill are already being carried on by the Office of Declassification and Technical Services of the Department of Commerce. This office, which includes the National Inventors Council, was created by Executive order of the President under wartime powers. The President has also transferred to this office the functions of the Office of Production Research and Development of the old War Production Board and the Technical Advisory Service of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. In short, this present office in the Department of Commerce is doing much of the job of giving technical services to business and industry which the Fulbright bill provides, but most of these powers spring from wartime authority. It is our responsibility to make these functions a peacetime basis, so as to insure that the businessman, particularly the small businessman, gets a break. If we do not, we will be telling small business that we were willing to help them to get war production, but we are not interested in the welfare of small business in time of peace.

The services called for under the bill are not new ideas in American economy. Farmers for years have been receiving the benefits of the latest information in scientific agriculture through similar facilities in the Department of Agriculture.

Another important point to which I wish to invite attention is the cost of operations under this bill. Simply stated, the enactment of S. 1248, the Fulbright bill, would only cost this Government some $2,750,000 more than is now being expended for this work. The reason for this low figure is that many existing facilities and personnel of the Department of Commerce, particularly the National Bureau of Standards and the field offices, as well as the present Office of Declassification and Technical Services, will be fully utilized to provide this service to the American businessman.

I think it is clear, therefore, that this bill does not provide a hastily drawn, untried plan; instead, it provides a carefully drawn, tried, practical, and realistic plan, which will be of tremendous assistance to all businessmen in the United States, and is a "must" as far as the smaller businessman is concerned. It authorizes a continuance in peacetime of the tested and proven technical service which was provided during the war.

It is clear to me that every type of small and large businessman will benefit by the work of the Office of Technical and Scientific Services. It will cover most of the different fields of interest to business. A recent survey which I requested the Department of Commerce to make shows the range these projects might cover. Proposed projects include the assembly and publication of existing technical data on new metals and alloys for electrical equipment, weights and measures used in foreign trade, materials used in air conditioning, fire-retardant treatments for textiles, new paints and finishes, structural adhesives, waterproofing of concrete, cleaning of masonry, welding fluxes, and plastics molding. These are only a few examples of hundreds of fields where information of value to small business is waiting to be published and disseminated. This type of research into the scientific applied problems of businessmen can only aid and assist them. For this reason we should, we must, consider the Fulbright bill at a very early date.

I am confident that two facts will stand out during consideration of this bill. In the first place, there is no sound opposition to the bill, because it does not prejudice the interests of any group. In the second place, the bill is one of the most useful and practical small business measures yet proposed.

Mr. President, it occurs to me that it is high time the Congress seriously considered the plight of small business. The number of casualties resulting from the reconversion effort in the field of small business is alarming, and unless we maintain small business in this country in a strong, healthy, wholesome condition, I fear that our failure will have an effect upon our democracy itself.

All over the world new scientific developments have taken place and have been applied. Those scientific developments, the new processes, the new procedures, would improve the lot of the businessmen of this country. They would help keep our economy ahead of the developments in other countries. Encouraging them is one of the measures vitally necessary to our security. Therefore it occurs to me that after we consider and make our decision with reference to the Kilgore-Magnuson bill, which applies to pure and basic creative science, we should follow that by taking up the Fulbright bill as quickly thereafter as is practicable, because that bill pertains to another field, the field of applied science in the developing and in the spreading of information to the businessmen of our country with regard to the new techniques and new procedures which have resulted from the Nation's war effort.

I wish to make clear the point that the so-called Fulbright bill was under consideration heretofore on two different occasions, and it was set aside, in my judgment, through a misunderstanding. That misunderstanding rooted from the fact that there was another bill, the Magnuson-Kilgore bill, and if both bills could be considered within a reasonably short time of each other misunderstanding would not develop, because the bills are separate measures, their objectives are entirely different, they are not related, and we can be for one without being against the other. There is no duplication of effort, and in my judgment both the bills will prove very helpful.

Mr. President, I wanted to make clear that the Fulbright bill, reported by the unanimous vote of the Committee on Commerce, is separate and distinct from the Magnuson-Kilgore bill, and pertains to a different field, the field of applied science, and that it will be of great benefit to the business interests of the United States, particularly the small businessmen.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish first to endorse what the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] has said about the objectives of the bills. While the bills do not duplicate each other, I think they are complementary in the sense that if we are to get full advantage out of the scientific progress which has been made in pure science, it is necessary to have some medium through which to bring the new knowledge to businessmen, especially the small and medium-sized businessmen, or to large business, for that matter, because there is no practical process or machinery by which such information is made available to the business people of the country. If Congress should pass the Kilgore-Magnuson bill and fail to pass a bill similar to the bill referred to by the Senator from New York, we would have gone only half way. We would not have brought down to the levels where it could be used the knowledge developed under the Magnuson bill.

Mr. MEAD. My colleague is quite correct. If, as a result of the passage of the Kilgore-Magnuson bill new scientific developments result, then the agency proposed to be set up by the Senator's bill would more quickly bring such developments to the attention of the businessmen of the country. So there is a relationship, in that one complements the other. But the point I wanted to make was that the bill which the Senator is sponsoring does not duplicate the work provided for in the Kilgore-Magnuson bill; on the other hand, the Kilgore-Magnuson bill does not duplicate the work provided for in the Senator's bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is quite true. They have different functions, but they both contribute to the same end to a great extent.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And I think both are necessary to an effective, well-rounded program.

Mr. MEAD. As I pointed out, I favor both bills. One will prove invaluable in the field of basic science. The other will prove very helpful to the business interests of the country in the field of applied science.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, one other matter. I came in, unfortunately, after the Senator had begun his remarks. Did the Senator state that he was going to move to take up my bill

after completion of the Kilgore-Magnuson bill?

Mr. MEAD. No. It was suggested that we act on the Kilgore-Magnuson bill, and then I took the floor to point out the possibility of considering the Fulbright bill as quickly after the disposition of the Kilgore-Magnuson bill as practical for us to do, having in mind the appropriation bills and such other matters as might take precedence over it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Since several Members have previously stated that they did not want the so-called Fulbright bill considered until the other bill has been considered, I think notice should be given now that it is our intention to bring up the so-called Fulbright bill as soon as possible after the disposition of the Kilgore-Magnuson bill.

Mr. MEAD. So there will be no possibility of misunderstanding the situation, I leave the thought with the Senate that so soon as possible after the disposition of the Kilgore-Magnuson bill I shall move consideration of the Fulbright bill.

THE SHORTAGE OF MATERIAL TO CARRY ON THE VETERANS' HOUSING PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the veterans of the country, along with a great many other homeless citizens, are vitally concerned with the progress of the housing program. Some time ago the Senate and the House of Representatives passed certain legislation to expedite the construction of homes which would be within the means of the veterans. The other day there appeared in the Washington Post a full page advertisement describing a new business center which had been recently constructed, including a new theater and various other commercial establishments I think that no fair-minded person doubts that in building homes for veterans it is, of course, necessary to have certain other buildings which go to make up a community, including, of course, schools and churches and certain essential commercial activities. But it seemed to the veterans of this city, and particularly one of their national organizations, that a great many of these buildings did not fall within that essential classification, particularly so at a time when they have been unable to secure the necessary building materials in order to construct the homes which, after years of service to their country overseas or in the United States, they so sorely need.

The situation, Mr. President, was so serious, that the president of one of the new national veterans organizations, the Amvets, addressed a letter to Mr. John D. Small, Civilian Production Administrator, and, because I believe the situation is of such importance and the problem facing the veteran is so serious, I am going to take a few moments of the Senate's time to read the letter written by Mr. Jack Hardy to Mr. Small. The letter follows:

JUNE 27, 1946.

Mr. JOHN D. SMALL,
Civilian Production Administrator,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SMALL: The veterans of World War II and the Members of Congress must have been as startled and shocked as I, to see in today's issue of the Washington Post a full-page advertisement by the Shirlington Corp., of Washington, D. C., stating that there had been constructed and were currently in operation, 23 stores at Shirlington on the Shirley Highway, 2½ miles from the Pentagon Building, and that the most beautiful unit of a large restaurant chain was under construction there, as were 5 clothing stores, a shoe store, a jewelry store, and a picture frame shop.

This full-page ad further states that a woman's specialty shop of 18,000 square feet and a large department store will be "soon under construction" and that "other stores to come" include an auto agency and accessory store, a bowling alley and furniture, candy, hardware, optical, and ice cream stores.

Within 2 miles of Shirlington are vacant lots where builders who already have permits to build veterans' homes have put in foundations and are unable to continue because not a brick nor foot of lumber is available for residential construction. At the same time a mountain of brick and other critically needed building materials continue day after day to go into commercial construction for private profit, while millions of veterans and their families are virtually homeless.

The veterans of World War II and the many other deserving homeless Americans are full to the teeth and sick to death with excuses, double talk, evasion, softsoap, and delay. Official explanations to date are entirely unsatisfactory. They add nothing, and make not one foot of lumber or one brick available where it is most critically and urgently needed—in residential construction for the veterans of this war and their families and the many other needy Americans.

As national commander of the Amvets and on behalf of all veterans we demand immediate action to stop all nonessential commercial construction and that the material now going into construction of the type be made available immediately for veterans and other essential housing construction.

Mr. Administrator, the "chickens are coming home to roost" on the doorstep of those charged with responsibility for the national home building program for the particular benefit of the veterans of this war as determined by the President and the Congress of the United States.

The commercial building situation in Washington is not different than those which can be observed in dozens of other cities and smaller communities throughout the Nation. This situation borders on a national scandal. We are faced—and there are none who can outface us in our position—by a situation to which the will of Congress is being thwarted by local groups of selfish individuals, who are taking advantage of the loopholes in the laws and regulations to push construction which is for their selfish gain.

One of the big loopholes is the present composition of the CPA construction committees in the 71 CPA districts throughout the country which advise the district construction managers of CPA on the "essentiality" and nondeferability of nonhousing building, alteration, and repair projects.

These committees, set up for the most part while the members of this and other veterans' organizations were serving their Nation actively in the armed forces, do not include those most directly concerned with and interested in residence construction—veterans of World War II. It is urged that such committees be reorganized at once and that World War II veterans be placed thereon so that the interests of the veterans may be protected and the will and intent of the Congress followed to the letter.

In a national press release on Tuesday of this week the Civilian Production Administration points with pride to the fact that CPA "was able to turn back approximately 450,000 projects before they reached the formal application stage by persuading the applicants either that their projects were not essential or that they could be deferred." That is an imposing figure. The fact remains, however, that the approach was negative rather than positive, as shown by the figures for the remaining 10 percent. "From the remaining 10 percent nearly 50,000 who were convinced that their projects were essential and nondeferable or where stoppage would have resulted in extreme hardship, CPA sifted out 31,457 for approval and denied 14,971, Mr. Small said," the press release continued.

There we have in your words the fact that 31,457 applications for nonhousing construction were approved during the first 11 weeks of CPA control. Construction cost of these projects totals $1,370,751,048.

"A good part of the approved construction will not begin to draw on the building materials market until 4 to 6 months after the projects were approved, and hence it is not having immediate effect on housing," you are quoted, says the press release of CPA. That weak and vacillating administration of commonly established rules, even though they were written with firm determination, can result in equivocation and frustration is evidence in the building field today. We have agency pitted against agency and legal opinion buffetted against legal opinion. This situation cannot long continue without detrimental effect on the morale of the people, the faith of whom in orderly government must be maintained."

A Government agency must not only follow the letter of the law, but also must be guided by the full spirit of the law. There are none who can truthfully say that it was not the will of the people through the Congress that the green light be given fully to the home-construction program and that it be given first priority. In our opinion, now is the time to get back to fundamentals and to put the building materials where they belong—for the construction of homes for veterans and other homeless people. The chickens have truly "come home to roost" on the doorstep of official Washington. It is time to act. We ask that you fulfill your duties under the law now.

Sincerely,

JACK W. HARDY,
National Commander.

Mr. President, I think the national commander of that organization has put his finger on a very critical situation facing the country. I hope that the Administration, Mr. Wyatt, and Mr. Small will take immediate steps to investigate the charges made by Commander Hardy and his organization, and will do whatever is necessary to expedite the channeling of building materials into homes for veterans, until that problem can be met and solved.

AMENDMENT OF EMERGENCY FARM MORTGAGE ACT AND FEDERAL FARM MORTGAGE CORPORATION ACT

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to report favorably, with the amendment, House bill 6477, to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended, and section 3 of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes; and I submit a report (No. 1634) thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report will be received.

Mr. MURDOCK. I have talked with the majority leader [Mr. BARKLEY] and the minority leader, the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], and they have agreed to the consideration of

the bill at this time unless there is objection on the part of some other Senator. I now ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, may I ask what the bill is? I do not recognize it by the number.

Mr. MURDOCK. The purpose of the bill is to extend the authority for 1 year to make Land Bank Commissioner loans. We have been making such loans for a number of years, and it is thought by those who are administering the law that the authority should be extended for an additional year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with amendments, in section 3, on page 2, line 19, after the name "Federal", to insert "Farm"; and on page 3, line 1, after the word "on", to strike out "Agriculture and Forestry" and insert in lieu thereof "Banking and Currency."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

EXTENSION OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a few days ago the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency reported Senate Joint Resolution 156, Calendar No. 1545, to extend the succession, lending powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It is necessary to obtain action upon this measure. There is no opposition in the committee. I may say that another appropriation bill will soon be reported, but the report has not yet arrived. It is expected soon. While we are waiting for it, I thought we might dispose of this measure.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, did I correctly understand the Senator to say that the joint resolution has the approval of the Committee on Banking and Currency?

Mr. BARKLEY. It has the unanimous approval of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 156) to extend the succession, lending powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment, on page 2, line 2, after the numerals "1952" and the semicolon, to insert "and"; and in the same line, after the word "section", to strike out "5 (d)" and insert in lieu thereof "5d", so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That, (a) the first sentence of section 4 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out "for a period of 15 years from the date of the enactment hereof" and inserting in lieu thereof "through June 30, 1952"; and the first sentence of section 14 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out "at the expiration of the 15 years for which the Corporation has succession hereunder" and inserting in lieu thereof "prior to July 1, 1952"; and (b) section 5d of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, the act approved January 26, 1937 (50 Stat. ch. 6, p. 5), as amended, and the act approved February 11, 1937 (50 Stat., ch. 10, p. 19), as amended, are hereby further amended by striking out "January 22, 1947" wherever appearing and in each instance inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1949."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, is this a measure extending the Reconstruction Finance Corporation?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. For the purpose of the RECORD, I should like to state that unfortunately I was absent attending a conference in Bermuda on the day this measure was considered by the Committee on Banking and Currency. I realize that the RFC will be extended in spite of my views, but I wish to express my own opinion that it is time to consider the liquidation of this agency. I feel that in view of its history and the reasons for its organization in the midst of a depression, it would be entirely proper for us to provide for its liquidation under present conditions. As I have said I was not present when the committee met, and did not register any opposition at that time. However, I feel that it would be a very reassuring gesture to the country if the activities of this agency which should be continued were returned to the Treasury Department and to the Department of Agriculture, and the agency itself discontinued. This would go far to disprove the often repeated statement, that we can never rid ourselves of a bureau or agency, even when the conditions which called it forth have passed. If we should need the RFC again in the future it would be easy to recreate it. In view of the enormous growth of bureaus and the necessity for some curtailment in Government expenditures, it does seem to me that it would be a good thing to liquidate this agency, not only because of its psychological effect but also because it would return to the Treasury substantial assets which are no longer needed for the purposes of the original RFC. This would demonstrate to all that our democratic system is sufficiently flexible to meet emergencies and at the same time is able to avoid the dead hand of an ever-expanding bureaucracy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 156) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess for an hour.

There being no objection, the Senate (at 12 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) took a recess for 1 hour.

On the expiration of the recess the Senate reassembled and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6496) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 59 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 12, 19, and 62 to the bill and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Overton
Andrews	Hill	Pepper
Ball	Hoey	Radcliffe
Barkley	Huffman	Reed
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Burch	Kilgore	Russell
Bushfield	Knowland	Smith
Byrd	La Follette	Stanfill
Capehart	Lucas	Stewart
Capper	McCarran	Swift
Carville	McClellan	Taft
Chavez	McKellar	Taylor
Donnell	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	Magnuson	Tobey
Ferguson	Mead	Tunnell
Fulbright	Millikin	Wagner
George	Mitchell	Wherry
Gerry	Moore	White
Gossett	Morse	Wiley
Green	Murdock	Willis
Guffey	Myers	Wilson
Gurney	O'Daniel	Young
Hart	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6739, making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the

fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6739) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6739), which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the amount of the bill as passed by the House was $1,136,500,238. The amount of the net increase by the Senate committee was $14,928,127. The amount carried by the bill as reported to the Senate is $1,151,428,365. The amount of the appropriations for 1946 was $1,202,631,586. The amount of the regular and supplemental estimates for 1947, is $1,178,075,900. The bill as reported to the Senate is under the estimates for 1947 by $26,647,535, and is under the appropriations for 1946 by $51,203,221.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The first amendment of the committee will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Department of Labor—Office of the Secretary," on page 2, line 4, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$862,000" and insert "$937,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 8, after the word "services", to strike out "$925,000" and insert "$979,645."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 3, after "$2,000)", to strike out "$695,528" and insert "$727,104."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 5, after "Department of Labor", to strike out "$3,137,033" and insert "$3,170,981."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 15, after "Department of Labor", to strike out "$652,410" and insert "$65,782."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Labor Statistics", on page 5, line 19, after the word "laws", to strike out "$4,772,000" and insert "$5,043,587"; in line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$3,050,000" and insert "$3,113,654"; and in line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$685,913" and insert "$857,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Children's Bureau," on page 7, line 17, after the word "periodicals", to strike out "$438,535" and insert "$501,664."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "United States Employment Service," on page 13, line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$10,417" and insert "$62,500"; in line 9, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$149,200" and insert "$895,220"; and in line 11, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$17,129,250" and insert "$34,258,500, and, without limitation upon the availability of other funds for the same purposes, $11,000,000 for the liquidation of unrecorded and contingent obligations, including the payment of accrued annual leave, arising in connection with the transfer of employment office facilities and services to State operation; in all, $45,258,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 8, to strike out:

GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT OFFICES

For payment to the several States, beginning October 1, 1946, in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 6, 1933, as amended to January 1, 1942 (29 U. S. C. 49–491), and for carrying into effect section 602 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, the sum of $51,387,750: *Provided*, That no State shall be required to make any appropriation as provided in section 5 (a) of said act of June 6, 1933, as amended to January 1, 1942, prior to July 1, 1948.

And insert in lieu thereof:

For grants to States (including Alaska and Hawaii) beginning January 1, 1947, to finance the proper and efficient administration of State-wide systems of public employment offices, in accordance with standards and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor as necessary to carry out this act, title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 and the purposes of the act of Congress approved June 6, 1933, as amended (excluding section 5 thereof), and, upon the request of any State, for the payment of rental for space made available to such State in lieu of grants for such purpose, $34,258,500, of which $288,500 shall be available to the United States Employment Service for all necessary expenses, including personal services, in connection with the operation of employment office facilities and services in the District of Columbia.

On December 31, 1946, the Secretary of Labor shall transfer, to the State agency in each State designated under section 4 of the act of Congress approved June 6, 1933, as amended, as the agency to administer the State-wide system of public employment offices in cooperation with the United States Employment Service under said act, the operation of State and local public employment office facilities and properties which were transferred by such State to the Federal Government in 1942 to promote the national war effort. The Secretary of Labor may also provide for the transfer and assignment to such State, without reimbursement therefor, of any other public employment office facilities and properties, including records, files, and office equipment: *Provided*, That as a condition to such transfer and assignment of Federal properties, the Secretary may require the recipient State to waive any claim which may then exist or thereafter arise out of the use made by the Federal Government of, or for the loss of or damage to, property and facilities transferred to the Federal Government as hereinabove described.

The Secretary of Labor shall withhold or deny certifications of funds for a State system of public employment offices unless he finds that the State—

(1) (a) has made provision for the transfer to and retention in the State-wide system of public employment offices of employees of the Federal Government who (on the day preceding the effective date of the transfer of the employment offices to the State under this act) have been employed in State or local employment service functions in such State, in the positions occupied by them under the Federal service or in reasonably comparable positions, except that individuals so transferred may be separated or terminated for good cause as determined in individual cases under the applicable State merit system, or separated or terminated under the applicable State merit system by reason of reductions in force found necessary in the interests of efficient operations, and may be separated (A) if they have failed to acquire eligibility for continued employment in the State-wide system of public employment offices under the State merit system in the positions occupied by them under the Federal service or in reasonably comparable positions, after having been given a reasonable opportunity to acquire such eligibility, or (B) if the Secretary has determined that it is impracticable for them to be given an opportunity to acquire such eligibility; and (b) has made provision for the extension to employees of the Federal Government who left employment-service positions in such State in order to perform training and service in the land or naval forces of the United States or service in the merchant marine as defined in Public Law No. 87, Seventy-eighth Congress, of the same employment rights and privileges as those provided for Federal employees transferring to State employment in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph; or

(2) has requested the detail of the employees referred to in clause (1) (a) of this paragraph to the State agency under the following provisions: So much of the funds appropriated for State-wide systems of public employment offices as may be necessary shall be available to the Secretary of Labor, in lieu of any portion of the grant to the State, for the payment of compensation (under the salary scales applicable to such employees prior to the effective date of the transfer of the employment offices to the State under this act) to employees of the United States Employment Service in the Department of Labor, who, upon the request of the State, and for the purpose of permitting continuity in their employment pending an opportunity to acquire eligibility for State employment in accordance with clause (1) (a) of this paragraph, may be detailed by the Secretary of Labor to the State agency for service in the State-wide system of public employment offices.

Notwithstanding any other provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended, any person who was appointed to a position in the Social Security Board under Executive Order 8990, of December 23, 1941, and who shall have returned to employment with the State at any time prior to the end of 1 year after the return to State operation of the employment offices in such State, shall, if he so elects, be paid a refund of the total amount of his deductions and deposits under this act, together with interest to the date of termination of his service with the Federal Government; and such person shall not receive any annuity benefits under said act based on the service covered by the refund unless he is subsequently reinstated, retransferred, or reappointed to a position coming within the purview of said act and redeposits all moneys, except voluntary contributions, so refunded to him, together with interest at 4 percent compounded on December 31 of each year, except that interest shall not be required

covering any period of separation from the service.

In carrying out the provisions under this heading, the Secretary shall assure that each State agency operates under such methods of administration relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, as are found by the Secretary to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this heading (except that the Secretary shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods), and has made reasonable provision for facilitating the free movement of workers seeking employment and employers seeking workers, and for the replacement of any funds appropriated by the Congress for State systems of public employment offices which, because of any action or contingency, have been lost or have been expended for purposes other than or in amounts in excess of those found necessary by the Secretary for the proper and efficient administration of the State system of public employment offices.

The Secretary of Labor is authorized to expend in any State, after January 1, 1947, so much of the funds appropriated for State systems of public employment offices as may be necessary to operate a State-wide system of public employment offices under the control of the Secretary if no State system of public employment offices exists in such State or if, and for so long as, the State is not eligible for Federal funds for such purposes. Except to the extent that a system of employment offices under the control of the Secretary is operated within a State either (1) pursuant to the specific request of the governor of such State, or (2) with funds specifically appropriated by the Congress for the operation of such system under the control of the Secretary, the Secretary shall not expend more than $1,000,000 in any fiscal year for the purposes of this paragraph or operate a system of employment offices in any State pursuant to this paragraph for more than 3 months in any fiscal year.

Whenever funds are paid to the same State agency for the purposes of this act and of title III of the Social Security Act, as amended, (1) such State agency may, if it so elects, submit to the Secretary and the Social Security Board a joint budget covering both the function for which grants are made under this act and the functions for which grants are made under such title III; in such case, the Secretary of Labor shall, if the State agency so elects, certify to the Social Security Board the amounts to be paid to the State for the purposes of this act and upon receipt of such certification, the Social Security Board shall certify such amounts to the Secretary of the Treasury, in addition to the amount, if any, payable by said Board under the provisions of section 302 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended. Any additional amounts so certified by the Social Security Board shall be paid to the State by the Secretary of the Treasury out of the appropriation herein made available; and (2) the State agency may commingle such funds and account therefor by such accounting, statistical, sampling, or other methods as may be found by the Secretary of Labor and the Social Security Board, respectively, to afford reasonable assurance that the funds paid to the State agency for the purposes of this act and the funds paid to the State agency under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended, are expended for the respective purposes of this act and such title III.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I draw the attention of the Senator from Georgia to the amendment just stated.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to be heard on this amendment. I have been in conference with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] who I understand has been interested in the insertion in the bill of substantially the bill recently passed by the Senate, and on which I understand also from the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, the House has declined a conference, and has therefore stopped action upon the bill as it left the Senate.

My objection to this particular phase of the new language inserted in the bill is that it goes a shade beyond the original power of the Secretary to make rules and regulations and to prescribe standards which the States must meet in setting up their employment services.

I think the Senator from Minnesota is willing to accept an amendment which I have discussed with him which will obviate this difficulty so far as I am concerned.

When the United States Employment Service Act was before the Senate, it was repeatedly stated that the Federal Government was paying all the cost and the State governments none of it, and that, therefore, the Secretary of Labor, who now has jurisdiction in the premises, should fix the standards and the regulations. That is a misconception of the facts. Actually when we provided for the State employment system it was on a basis of joint State and Federal action. The Congress levied a tax, but the Congress gave to the States the right to recapture all but three-tenths of 1 percent of the tax, provided the States would come in with their own plans for a joint State and Federal employment service. When the States came in with their plans, they had to sit down with the Secretary and had to square the plans with certain minimum standards fixed by the Secretary. But to talk about the Federal Government furnishing all the money is not a realistic approach to the problem at all. The Federal Government has no money except what it gets out of the taxpayers of the States, and we were desirous of setting up a joint State and Federal employment service. So we levied a tax, and said to the States, "If you will pass your act setting up this service, you may recapture or have a credit for all but three-tenths of 1 percent of the tax levied by the Federal Government. Then the three-tenths is to be repaid for the purpose of bearing the administrative costs of the joint State and Federal program."

Therefore, Mr. President, it is not a case of the Federal Government furnishing the money. It is a case of the Federal Government having levied a tax, but saying in the same breath, "We are levying this for a joint State and Federal purpose. Now we ask the States to cooperate, to pass acts, to take back 2.7 percent of the money which we are taking out of the taxpayers of the States and passing it back in this way."

Under that system the State and Federal Government sat down together and established a joint plan. We did say that the Secretary would have the authority to fix certain minimum standards which the State must meet. But in this language, and in the bill which the Senate passed a few days ago, the Secretary is given the absolute right to make of every State official administering the employment service nothing but a mere clerk to carry out the dictates of the Department of Labor here in Washington. Every day he would have to get a directive, every night he would have to change his course if he got another directive. That is what I do not want to have happen.

If these employment services are to go back to the States at all, they should as a matter of good faith go back to them just as we took them away from the States, or as they voluntarily turned them over to us. If they are not to go back, and we wish a completely federalized system, that is a totally different question, but it is now proposed that we turn them back.

I have no objection to the provision giving the Secretary of Labor the power to fix standards and regulations to carry out title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, which he must have anyway, since that service has been transferred to him, and to issue rules and regulations and to prescribe standards for the purposes of the act of Congress approved June 6, 1933. But the two are altogether different, when we consider that, in the first instance, we were setting up a joint system, and now it is proposed that we give to the Secretary of Labor this broad, general authority to fix the standards and regulations as the condition on which the State shall get back its service, with the further provision that if the State does not comply with such standards, if it fails to meet the standards and regulations, then the Secretary of Labor may recapture the State system and bring it back into the Federal system.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BALL. I discussed this provision with the distinguished Senator from Georgia, and I am in accord with him that we do not need in this bill to expand greatly the power of the Secretary of Labor. I agree with the Senator that it is not wise normally to put this much legislation, such lengthy provisions, in an appropriation bill. But the substantive legislation which the Senate passed earlier this week has been bottled up in the Rules Committee of the House, with no indication that it will ever even get to conference, and in order that the transfer back to the States of the services may be made in an orderly manner, and that the Federal employees may at least be given a chance to qualify for State employment, it is necessary to include some provisions, particularly from title III of the bill which we passed earlier last week, in the pending appropriation bill.

I agree with the Senator from Georgia about the language on page 15 in the committee amendment, and I move to amend by striking out on lines 21, 22, and 23, the language "in accordance with standards and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor as necessary to carry out this act," and to insert in lieu thereof the words, "to carry out," so that it will read, "to carry out title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield for the offering of the amendment?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Minnesota from what page he has been reading?

Mr. BALL. From page 15 of the bill, lines 21, 22, and 23.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, that amendment at that point in the bill is satisfactory to me. Of course, I am not speaking for anyone else, but it does meet the objection which I had in mind, and which seems to me to be entirely valid if we are to have a joint State and Federal system.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, before accepting the amendment, I should like to know whether there are other amendments to the italicized language.

Mr. GEORGE. There is one other amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. I wonder if we may not have the other amendment discussed, then accept both of them together.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is one on page 20, as the Chair recalls.

Mr. BALL. The other amendment is on page 17, in line 21, after the word "employment", to insert the following language: "superior to that of any war veteran competing for appointment." The effect of that, Mr. President, is simply to make sure that if the Federal employees transfer, and if they are not war veterans, they take a competitive examination, but if a war veteran gets a higher eligibility rating the war veteran gets the appointment. That was our objective all along.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no objection to the amendment. I accept the amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. That is the amendment I wanted to have incorporated in the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The proposed amendment on page 15 has not been agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. I accept that amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to speak to this matter before the amendment is acted on, because I want to be sure that I know what it does.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have the floor, and I yielded to the Senator from Georgia, who in turn yielded to the Senator from Minnesota. Does the Senator from Georgia have any amendment to propose?

Mr. GEORGE. No. Those are the two amendments which I said are necessary and proper. In view of the fact that the bill which was passed earlier in the week has not been sent to conference, and therefore there is no opportunity in connection with that bill to iron out the differences between the two Houses, I readily accede to the proposal made by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota and the distinguished Senator from Nevada that it is necessary to have something in the bill so that the conferees may be able to act intelligently.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Minnesota for the amendments which I have accepted.

I now yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to go along with the proposal made by the Senator from Minnesota, if the amendment means what he says it means; but for the record I desire to make perfectly clear that it does protect the standards which were fought for on the floor of the Senate last Tuesday. If this is a way of reopening the controversy that took place on the floor of the Senate last Tuesday, on which we had a series of record votes, and which I think settled the issues by rather a preponderant majority of the Senate, I want to know it before I vote on the question. Therefore I wish to read a brief statement, and to ask the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Nevada, when I get through, if the situation is as presented by this statement is a correct statement of fact:

As I understand, these provisions were included in the Labor appropriation bill as a substitute for substantive legislation inserted as a rider in the Labor bill by the House. These are the significant factors: (1) The House is attempting to effectuate the return of the Employment Services to the States by substantive legislation attached as a rider to the Labor appropriation bill. This substantive legislation is the provision which would modify the Wagner-Peyser Act requiring the States to match Federal funds granted and instead provide for 100 percent Federal financing. (2) The Senate passed substantive legislation (H. R. 4437) on June 25, 1946, which would have returned the Employment Services to the States in an orderly manner, but the House has refused to appoint conferees to consider the bill. Thus, the Senate has been balked by House action in its efforts to return the Employment Services to State operation under H. R. 4437. (3) The Senate must either accept the House rider in the Labor appropriation bill, which constitutes substantive legislation wholly inadequate to accomplish the return of the USES in an orderly manner, or must substitute the necessary provisions to effectuate an orderly return.

The following provisions from H. R. 4437, as passed by the Senate, are contained in the Labor appropriation bill:

1. Return of the Employment Services to the States and authority to transfer property and records needed to operate the Employment offices.

2. Transfer of personnel to State employment until they can be given an opportunity to take an examination for permanent employment.

3. Authority to return to such employees the deductions to their credit in the Federal Civil Service Retirement fund.

4. Requirement for States to maintain a merit system governing the employment in the States of these personnel.

5. Requirement that States refund misspent moneys.

6. Guarantee of operations of local offices clause.

7. Requirement for Secretary to certify funds through the Social Security Board where States submit a single budget unemployment compensation and employment service.

I should like one of the pages to take the memorandum to the Senator from Nevada so that he may have it before him as we carry on this discussion.

I may say to the chairman of the subcommittee that if this so-called rider language in the Labor appropriation bill accomplishes the purposes set forth in the memorandum which I have sent to the Senator from Nevada, in that event I do not find myself in disagreement at least with the objectives of the language in this bill, but I should like to have an answer to this question: Am I correct in my understanding, after listening to the Senator from Minnesota, that if this language is adopted, along with the amendment to which he has agreed with the Senator from Georgia, the Secretary of Labor will have the continued authority in a specific State case to insist that the State meet the decent minimum standards which he will prescribe for the operation of the State's employment service? In other words will the failure on the part of a State to set up minimum standards result in no Federal money going to the State until minimum standards are set up? Further I ask does the Secretary of Labor under the rider have the authority to function under the so-called guaranty-of-operations clause?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Minnesota, as the question is addressed to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I will say in reply to the Senator from Oregon that a great many of the substantive changes—in fact, most of the substantive changes which we made in the Wagner-Peyser Act in H. R. 4437, are not in this language.

We confined ourselves in this language primarily to provisions which we felt were absolutely necessary for an orderly transfer of the services back to the States. It is my contention that the amendments suggested do not at all affect those provisions which relate primarily to the right of the employees at least to be given an opportunity to acquire eligibility in the State service. The Secretary still has, of course, his basic authority to issue regulations and fix standards under the Wagner-Peyser Act. We do not change that at all. He has the authority delegated to him by General Bradley of the Veterans' Administration, under title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, to require that there be maintained an employment service for veterans. I do not think the language which we would strike out by this amendment was necessary, and it could be interpreted as perhaps broadening the authority which the Secretary has under the existing law.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to ask the Senator from Minnesota two or three further questions on this subject, because, as we pass upon this bill, I think it of great importance, so far as the intent of the Senate is concerned. Let us suppose that the State of Minnesota sets up an employment service, which in the opinion of the Secretary of Labor, under the rules and regulations as they have been administered heretofore, does not meet the minimum standards the Secretary of Labor believes ought to be met in order to justify the expenditure of Federal money for an employment service by the State of Minnesota, and he so notifies the authorities of the State of Minnesota. Assuming that this rider is the legislation which will be passed, will the Secretary

have the authority then to withhold from the State of Minnesota Federal funds, and, under the guaranty-of-operations clause of the bill which was passed by the Senate last Tuesday operate, for example, a Federal service for at least 90 days?

Mr. BALL. For 90 days only.

Mr. MORSE. For 90 days only. And within that 90-day period until such time as Minnesota and the Federal Government can iron out their differences?

Mr. BALL. Yes; he would have that authority. He has that authority under the basic Wagner-Peyser Act. He has to give the State opportunity for a hearing. As a matter of fact, I do not know of any case in the history of that act of funds having been withheld. They have a hearing and they eventually get together on operations. The recapture clause for the 90-day period is in this bill. Frankly I do not think it would ever go into effect, because in this Federal-State relationship, what happens is that they iron out their differences and get together on a mode of operation. It does assure continuity of service, as the Senator from Oregon says.

Mr. MORSE. In order that I may be perfectly clear about it, I further understand from the Senator from Minnesota that this so-called rider language will in no way destroy the rights of present Federal employees in the Employment Service if they meet the requirements of the examination on merit which would have to be given by the States under their own State civil-service regulations. Or, to put it this way: If a present Federal employee in Minnesota takes the merit examination in Minnesota on the return of the service to the State and is within the top three, would he have his so-called preference rights under the language of this rider?

Mr. BALL. Yes. In further reply I will say he would have a preference right unless he was not a war veteran and a war veteran was higher than he was on the eligible list.

Mr. MORSE. That was our agreement the other day, too.

Mr. BALL. Yes. And the language simply makes that clear.

Mr. MORSE. That is protected by the pending amendment. My next question is this: The Senator says that what is sought by this rider language is to return the service to the States in an orderly manner, but it does not contain all the substantive provisions of the bill which we agreed upon by majority vote last Tuesday.

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator from Minnesota tell the Senator from Oregon in what major aspects this rider language differs from the bill which the Senate passed the other day and which is now resting in the House of Representatives with a refusal on their part to appoint conferees?

Let me express a fear which is entertained by the Senator from Oregon. I assume that there must be some major differences between the language of the rider and the bill which the Senate passed, or that bill would be going through the House, and would not be blocked by a refusal to appoint conferees. I wish to know if what I am voting for involves a major difference as compared with the bill for which I voted the other day, and which I took an active part in trying to get through this body.

Mr. BALL. In House bill 4437 we rewrote the Wagner-Peyser Act completely. We somewhat broadened the purposes of that act. We eliminated the requirement for a plan, and gave the Secretary somewhat broader authority—although not as broad as some of the opponents of the bill contended—to set the standards and issue regulations by which the States would have to abide; and we included in it referral standards. None of those things are in this amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] who had charge of the other bill on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask the Senator from Delaware, who had the floor leadership in connection with the employment service bill last Tuesday, whether he is satisfied from the language of the so-called rider to this bill that the major objectives of the bill for which we fought on the floor of the Senate last Tuesday, which bill we succeeded in passing, are protected?

Mr. TUNNELL. I think they are protected. I should like to read a telegram which will show the objectives of those who were opposing House bill 4437. This telegram was sent on June 24:

H. R. 4437, DIRKSEN, covering return of employment service to States as amended by Education and Labor Committee, does not provide bona fide return. Repeals Federal recapture and control features opposed by all State unemployment administrators and the Governors Conference. House appropriations bill H. R. 6739 scheduled for consideration Senate next week will accomplish genuine return of employment service to State control October 1. Separate legislation covering transfer of personnel can follow later. Your opposition to H. R. 4437 as reported sought.

So this comes a long way from meeting the requirements of those who were opposing House bill 4437. I believe that it accomplishes the main thing sought to be accomplished by House bill 4437. I believe it is worth accepting.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President——

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Has the Senator from Oregon concluded?

Mr. MORSE. I have one further question. I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada, now that he has had an opportunity to look over the memorandum which I have submitted to him if he agrees that the points listed, which set forth my understanding of what is accomplished by this rider language, are an accurate statement of the effect of the rider?

Mr. McCARRAN. The language of the rider accomplishes each and every one of the seven points raised by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Nevada. I wish to make clear both to the Senator from Nevada and to the Senator from Minnesota that the primary objective of these questions is to lay a legislative foundation for any future court interpretation which may be called for on the basis of the intent of the Senate at the time the bill was passed.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. If the Senator does not mind, I should like to have read the several points raised by the Senator from Oregon. I was not in the Chamber when they were read.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I shall read the seven points raised by the Senator from Oregon. His question was whether or not the following provisions from House bill 4437 are contained in the rider:

1. Return of the employment service to the States and authority to transfer property and records needed to operate the employment offices.

That is accomplished by the rider.

2. Transfer of personnel to State employment until they can be given an opportunity to take an examination for permanent employment.

That is accomplished by the rider.

3. Authority to return to such employees the deductions to their credit in the Federal Civil Service Retirement fund.

That is accomplished by the rider.

4. Requirement for States to maintain a merit system governing the employment in the States of these personnel.

That is accomplished by the rider.

5. Requirement that States refund misspent moneys.

That is also accomplished by the rider.

6. Guaranty of operations of local offices clause.

That is accomplished by the rider.

7. Requirement for Secretary to certify funds through the Social Security Board where States submit a single budget Unemployment Compensation and Employment Service.

That is accomplished by the rider.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a further question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. STEWART. The fourth point is as follows:

Requirement for States to maintain a merit system governing the employment in the States of these personnel.

The Senator says that that is accomplished by the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. By the rider.

Mr. STEWART. By the provision in the so-called rider, or the amendment reported by the committee. Will the Senator point out that language?

Mr. McCARRAN. On page 17 of the bill——

Mr. BALL. If the Senator will yield, it is the paragraph at the top of page 20.

Mr. McCARRAN. The language is as follows:

In carrying out the provisions under this heading, the Secretary shall assure that each State agency operates under such methods

of administration relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, as are found by the Secretary to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this heading.

Mr. STEWART. Down to that point, that accomplishes approximately what I wished to inquire about. Does that mean that there shall be in each State a uniform merit system, or may one State have one kind of merit system, and another State another kind?

Mr. McCARRAN. Each State may have a merit system of its own.

Mr. STEWART. Suppose they are not uniform?

Mr. McCARRAN. They may not be uniform, but if they are acceptable to the Secretary, that is the standard.

Mr. STEWART. The point I am making is, Can the Secretary require that they be uniform?

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not so construe the language.

Mr. STEWART. The Secretary must approve them.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; but in approving them he does not necessarily require that they be uniform.

Mr. STEWART. Suppose he refuses to approve them unless they are uniform?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BALL. Let me say to the Senator from Tennessee that the only reason for that language is that in 1941, when these services were operated by the States, they were operated under two acts, the Wagner-Peyser Act and title III of the Social Security Act. At that time the President had transferred the Employment Service to the Social Security Board. Under title III of the Social Security Act the Social Security Board had exactly the same authority, in identical language with that contained in this bill, to require a merit system. As a matter of fact, the same language now applies to the administration of unemployment compensation. So when the employment offices were taken over by the Federal Government in January 1942, the States were operating under that identical language. But in this instance we make the appropriation solely to the Department of Labor, because since then the USES has been transferred to the Department of Labor, and the operation is entirely under the Wagner-Peyser Act, which contains no such clause. Merely to retain the same identical set-up which we had in 1941, we placed that language in the bill. It does not require a uniform system in all States. It merely requires that the appointments shall be made on some kind of merit basis. The Secretary has nothing to say about who is appointed, what he is paid, or how long his tenure shall be.

Mr. STEWART. If there is a requirement for a uniform merit system, as it is called, the system in my State or in the Senator's State may be under fire at some time or other because it does not accomplish what the Secretary desires to have accomplished. If the requirements of the Secretary as to the merit system are not met, what recourse does the State have?

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to make a suggestion?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I invite the attention of the Senator from Tennessee to the following language:

In carrying out the provisions under this heading, the Secretary shall assure that each State agency operates under such methods of administration relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis as are found by the Secretary to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this heading.

Under the language of that provision I do not think the Secretary will have any authority to go any further and say that systems have to be uniform.

Mr. STEWART. Then, looking beyond that, and skipping over some of the language, we find the provision:

Operates under such methods of administration * * * as are found by the Secretary to be necessary.

Mr. TUNNELL. Yes. That has been practically in effect under the Social Security Act for years.

Mr. STEWART. Then let me ask this question, and then I shall not bother the Senator very much more. On the same page, page 20, in line 9, after the parenthesis and the comma, we find the following words:

And has made reasonable provision for facilitating the free movement of workers seeking employment and employers seeking workers.

What does that mean?

Mr. TUNNELL. That is the very purpose of the act; namely, to try to enable those seeking employment to find employers, and to try to enable employers who are seeking help to find the employees.

Mr. STEWART. Was a similar provision contained in the bill which the Senate passed a few days ago?

Mr. TUNNELL. I think it is the exact language.

Mr. MORSE. It is the exact language.

Mr. TUNNELL. Yes; I am told that it is the exact language.

Mr. STEWART. Is there hidden in any of this rider or amendment any effort, so far as the Senator knows, to reinstate the so-called FEPC which was so obnoxious to a good many of us a few months ago?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], because this language was largely in his charge.

Will the Senator from Tennessee state his question again, please?

Mr. STEWART. I asked whether there is hidden within the words of the amendment or the rider, or within it, whether hidden or not hidden, an effort to reinstate the FEPC provisions pertaining to employment, particularly the employment of minority groups, which were so obnoxious to so many Senators a few months ago.

Mr. BALL. I say to the Senator, absolutely not.

Mr. STEWART. I am satisfied with that statement.

Mr. TUNNELL. I say to the Senator that that was in paragraph 11 of 4437, which came in under the Advisory Council.

Mr. STEWART. It was deleted from this?

Mr. TUNNELL. It was deleted from this.

Mr. McCARRAN. I say to the Senator that I am very sure there is none of it in this bill.

Mr. STEWART. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The question is on the adoption of the two amendments of the Senator from Minnesota to the committee amendment. Without objection, the two amendments will be considered en bloc.

The amendments to the committee amendment were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the adoption of the committee amendment as amended, striking out lines 9 to 17 on page 15, and inserting other matter, ending on page 22, in line 11.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, were both the amendments to the committee amendment adopted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Both the amendments to the committee amendment were adopted.

The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Federal Security Agency—Food and Drug Administration," on page 25, line 17, after the word "exceeding", to strike out "$800,000" and insert "$869,300"; in line 18, after the word "exceed", to strike out "35" and insert "85"; and in line 22, after the word "periodicals", to strike out "$3,037,181" and insert "$3,631,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 26, line 17, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$113,202" and insert "$133,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Freedmen's Hospital," on page 27, line 6, after the word "special", to strike out "intruction" and insert "instruction"; and in line 14, before the words "of the", to strike out "establishment" and insert "establishments."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Education," on page 29, line 15, after the word "among", to strike out "the more scholarly"; and on page 30, line 2, after the word "same", to strike out "$991,990" and insert "$1,200,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Health Service," on page 34, line 20, after the word "automobiles", to strike out "$14,565,000" and insert "$15,565,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 6, after the word "automobiles", to strike out "$1,950,000" and insert "$1,985,900."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, in line 21, after the word "regular", to insert "and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 25, after the words "purchase of", to strike out "two" and insert "twenty"; and on page 39, line 3, after "(5 U. S. C. 118 (a))", to strike out "$1,500,000" and insert "$2,061,813."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Saint Elizabeths Hospital," on page 41, line 12, after the word "residence", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further,* That not exceeding $200 additional may be paid to two employees to provide mail facilities for patients in the hospital."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Social Security Board," on page 44, line 8, after the word "herein", to strike out "$3,250,000" and insert "$3,497,535."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 20, after the word "automobiles", to strike out "$2,900,000" and insert "$3,028,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 19, after the word "and", to strike out "compenstion" and insert "compensation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Administrator, Federal Security Agency," on page 46, line 4, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$190,044" and insert "$195,659."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries and expenses, Office of Community War Services, Federal Security Agency," on page 47, after line 6, to insert:

Salaries and miscellaneous expenses, social protection: For all expenses necessary to enable the Federal Security Administrator to carry out the provisions of Public Law 163, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended by Public Law 381, Seventy-ninth Congress, and the provisions of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to assist the States in matters relating to social protection, and for other purposes" (S. 1779, 79th Cong., or H. R. 5234, 79th Cong.), when and if such act is enacted into law, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; not to exceed $15,000 for the temporary employment of persons by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and the civil-service and classification laws; acceptance and utilization of voluntary and uncompensated services; maintenance, operation, and repair of passenger automobiles; to accept the cooperation of the authorities of States and their counties, districts, and other political subdivisions, in carrying out the purposes of the acts; $460,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 2, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$109,885" and insert "$126,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 5, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$270,235" and insert "$289,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 19, after the word "employees", to strike out "by" and insert "of."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, line 8, after the word "journals", to strike out "$900,000" and insert "$1,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title IV—National Labor Relations Board," on page 54, line 23, after "(50 U. S. C., App. 1501–11)", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further,* That no part of the funds appropriated in this title shall be used in connection with investigation, hearings, directives, or orders concerning bargaining units composed in whole or in part of agricultural laborers as that term is defined in the Social Security Act in section 409, title 42, United States Code."

And on page 55, after line 4, to insert:

No part of the funds appropriated in this title shall be used by the National Labor Relations Board in any way in connection with any petition or complaint by or on behalf of any individual having authority, in the interest of an employer, to hire, transfer, lay off, recall, promote, demote, discharge, assign, reward, determine the amount of wages earned by, or discipline not less than five employees of the employer, or to adjust their grievances, or to effectively recommend any such action.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I think this amendment should have further consideration at the hands of the Senate. I think the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] might well explain the item.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, first let me ask whether the amendment striking out the proviso beginning in line 23 on page 54 has been adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not been adopted. Both parts of the amendment have been read, but no action has been taken.

Mr. McCARRAN. What was the action on the amendment striking out lines 23 and following on page 54?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question will be put on that amendment.

All in favor of the adoption of the amendment——

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Minnesota should explain the item.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I think the first part of the amendment relates to striking out the provisio in reference to packing-shed workers. That amendment begins in line 23, on page 54.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well.

Mr. BALL. I do not know whether there is any contest in regard to that item. I do not think there is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment striking out the proviso beginning in line 23 on page 54 and ending in line 4 on page 55.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment beginning in line 5, on page 55, inserting certain new matter.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly on the committee amendment in line 5 on page 55.

A week or two ago both the Senate and the House passed the so-called Case labor bill, section 9 of which provided that supervisors, as defined in that section, should no longer be considered employees for purposes of the Wagner Act. That section grew out of the fact that the National Labor Relations Board had rendered several conflicting 2-to-1 decisions. At first the decisions excluded supervisors from the definition of employees; but later, by another 2-to-1 decision, the Labor Board included them, and held that under the National Labor Relations Act the employer could be forced to bargain with a union of foremen or could be forced to permit his foremen to join a union, even a union of production workers.

The issue was discussed fully on the floor when that specific amendment to the Case bill was before the Senate. To my mind it is simply a question of divided loyalty. Under the court interpretations of the Wagner Act and the Board decisions, an employer may be cited and found guilty of an unfair labor practice on account of an act performed by a supervisor. The Board has now taken the position that the employer also may be required to recognize and deal with a production worker's union or an independent union of foremen. Particularly when they are in a production worker's union, they are in the position of having their loyalties divided. They are required to abide by the rules and constitution of the union, and at the same time they must represent the employer in the most important contact between management and the production workers.

It was the overwhelming opinion of both Houses of Congress that that situation did not make sense, and therefore they adopted that particular section of the Case bill, which did not deny the supervisory employees the right to join unions, but simply said that the Government, through its laws and this enforcement agency, would not force the employer to bargain with such a union, and would not require him to retain in his employ a foreman who joined the union against the employer's wishes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I wish to continue my statement first, please.

Mr. President, that bill was vetoed by the President; but in his veto message the President, in discussing this particular section, specifically said that he believed that that line must be drawn in legislation. He objected to the way the Congress had attempted to draw it, but he admitted there was a need for legislation on the subject. So it is clear that early in the next session of Congress we shall attempt to deal with this situation.

But now we are faced with the possibility or probability, I may say, that there will be a terrific drive on the part of both the CIO and the A. F. of L. to

organize foremen, with the full backing and support of the National Labor Relations Board, under their present interpretation of the act.

So when Congress reconvenes in January and attempts to deal with this question, we may find ourselves facing a fait accompli, namely, the fact that a great number of foremen have been organized into the unions, under the impetus and protection of the Wagner Act; and then it will be too late or at least much more difficult to deal with the subject legislatively. It is in an attempt to hold that situation in status quo until Congress and the President, both of whom have recognized the need for legislation on the subject, can agree on what is a proper remedy, that I have offered this limitation on the appropriation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, before I yield to the Senator from Oregon, I wish to say that, as regards this amendment, it grieves me very much to disagree with my young friend, the Senator from Minnesota. I was very much interested in his presentation of the amendment. I voted against it in the committee and I shall vote against it on the floor, because I do not believe it represents a proper method to employ in bringing about the result which the Senator from Minnesota desires. I believe that the result should be achieved by a legislative bill. However, the matter has been submitted to the Parliamentarian and it has been held that the proposal is a limitation, and it is not subject to the rules. As I have said I voted against the amendment in the committee, and when the amendment comes to a vote in the Senate I shall again vote against it.

I now yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks just made by the Senator from Nevada. I say to my good friend, the Senator from Minnesota, that I have great admiration for him. One of his qualities which I admire most of all is his absolute frankness and integrity of statement. I believe that he has just made a statement which is characteristic of statements made by him, whether on the floor of the Senate or off the floor of the Senate. He never leaves one in doubt as to where he stands on any issue or as to his motives. I admire that characteristic. It is one which I believe is highly desirable in all men.

The Senator has told us this afternoon, honestly and frankly, that the purpose of the language of the amendment is to seek to accomplish what, after all, he was not able to accomplish as one of the sponsors of the Case bill which was vetoed by the President.

Mr. President, it is true that the President of the United States did just exactly what the Senator from Minnesota has said he did, namely, to point out that a line should be drawn between rank-and-file workers and supervisory employees. However, there is nothing in the veto message which would support any conclusion, and I am sure the Senator from Minnesota did not imply it that the line which the Senator from Minnesota seeks to draw in this amendment and the type of line the President referred to. However, in order to avoid any danger of such an interpretation being made, I may point out that there is nothing in the language of the veto message on the Case bill which would support the conclusion that the line of this amendment is the line that the President of the United States thinks should be drawn when we draft legislation covering this subject.

The Senator from Minnesota is also quite correct in his statement that, in the next session of Congress, we will have before us the problem of adopting a labor code. I shall not consume the time of the Senate on this occasion to express my views as to the desirability of such a code. I have referred to it in other speeches on this floor. But what the committee amendment does seek to accomplish is that, by the proposed rider, we will now pass substantively on the whole question of organizing supervisory employees. I believe there to be only one place where that should be done. It should not be done in an appropriation bill but in the form of a bill for a labor code which I think will come before the Senate at the beginning of the next session of Congress.

What the Senator from Minnesota is trying to do—and I make no criticism of it—is to obtain what will amount to a legislative handicap favorable to those who seek the type of legislation affecting supervisory employees which the record of the Senator from Minnesota shows that he favors. I assert that the place to fight out that issue on the merits will be in the next session of Congress, next January and February, when we shall face head-on the question of what type of labor legislation substantively this body should pass. I think it is most unfortunate to seek to accomplish that objective this afternoon by way of an amendment to the pending appropriation bill.

Mr. President, I wish to make one more comment and then I shall be through. I assert that it is not fair for us at the present time, without due consideration which should be given to this matter in a committee, to say that we will vote for this proposal for the reason, among others, which the Senator from Minnesota advances, namely, the fear that between now and next January there may be a great organizational drive to bring about the organization of supervisory employees. Whether that will take place or not will have no bearing on what we should or may do on this issue in January or February next year. But until the matter can be handled in accordance with the ordinary procedure for the passing of substantive legislation, I do not believe this body should try to handle it by way of a rider to the pending bill.

Therefore, Mr. President, I may say that before we take a vote on this matter, it is the intention of the junior Senator from Oregon to suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask for a roll call vote on the rider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 54, beginning in line 23.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Overton
Andrews	Hill	Pepper
Ball	Hoey	Radcliffe
Barkley	Huffman	Reed
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Burch	Kilgore	Russell
Bushfield	Knowland	Smith
Byrd	La Follette	Stanfill
Capehart	Lucas	Stewart
Capper	McCarran	Swift
Carville	McClellan	Taft
Chavez	McKellar	Taylor
Donnell	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	Magnuson	Tobey
Ferguson	Mead	Tunnell
Fulbright	Millikin	Wagner
George	Mitchell	Wherry
Gerry	Moore	White
Gossett	Morse	Wiley
Green	Murdock	Willis
Guffey	Myers	Wilson
Gurney	O'Daniel	Young
Hart	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I wish to say a few words in opposition to the amendment. It seems that from a parliamentary standpoint it is permissible to attach such an amendment as this to an appropriation bill. I understand that it is a limitation instead of a substantive amendment, according to the precedents of the Senate. It is, however, just as much a violation of the spirit of the rule as can possibly be written. To each appropriation bill we now find antilabor amendments attached. On the very last day, supposedly, when appropriation bills can be passed, the very last week day before the end of the fiscal year an appropriation bill comes before the Senate containing what is generally recognized and what is intended to be an antilabor amendment.

Mr. President, is that to be a regular course of procedure? At the close of the fiscal year each time an appropriation bill comes before the Senate must we have a controversial amendment attached to be held as a club over the Senate and the Executive, since the bill must be passed at this time, to force the acceptance of these objectionable and controversial amendments? Is it a club over the people of the Nation?

I object to the spirit, I object to the principle of attaching such amendments, which are known as and which are in fact intended to be antilabor amendments, appropriation bills, and particularly at this time.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I insist that I have a right to the floor in my own right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thought the Senator from Minnesota had risen to obtain the floor. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress gave consideration to the ever growing practice of appropriation committees attaching legislative riders to appropriation bills in the guise of limitations on expenditures. I wish to read a paragraph or two from the report filed on March 5, 1946, on that bill:

> The practice of attaching legislation to appropriation bills is often destructive of orderly procedure. Riders obstruct and retard the consideration of supply bills. Sometimes they contradict action previously approved in carefully considered legislation.
>
> In most cases such legislation is adopted under the parliamentary guise of "limiting provisos," avoiding points of order that would be raised against them by purporting to restrict the spending of Government funds. These practices, when used for purposes other than to effect real economies, should be prohibited by a tightening of the rules.
>
> Otherwise the regular jurisdiction of the standing committees of the House and the Senate will continue to be impinged upon by the appropriating committees.

Mr. President, I concur whole-heartedly in that conclusion of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress.

During the period I have been a Member of this body I have seen this practice grow until today there is hardly an important appropriation bill brought up for consideration which does not contain in fact substantive amendments to existing law disguised in the terms of limitations on the expenditure of funds.

I do not quarrel at all with the interpretation of the rules and the precedents made by the Parliamentarian informally on this amendment. It is certainly drawn in the guise of a limitation on the expenditure of money. But there is not a Senator present who does not know that this makes a very substantive change in existing law, and violates the spirit, although not the letter, of the rules and precedents of the Senate.

Mr. President, I think the practice should be curtailed, and the bill for the organization of Congress which passed the Senate and is now awaiting action in the House includes a proposed amendment to rule 16 of the Senate, which makes an effort to limit and curtail the practice of obtaining substantive change in existing law in the guise of a limitation on the expenditure of funds.

Mr. President, the particular item under consideration has created a great deal of controversy before the National Labor Relations Board. Cases have come up and been argued and decided in one way, and the Board has heard other cases and has made decisions recently which look in another direction, so far as this problem is concerned.

I have no doubt that, if and when the concurrent resolution which has passed the House and is now in the Committee on Education and Labor, scheduled for consideration on Monday, is agreed to, creating a joint committee to study the whole question of labor relations and labor laws, that committee will give very serious and earnest consideration to the question which is involved in the pending amendment.

I do not think this is a wise or the sound way in which to legislate. I think a continuation of this practice as stated by the report of the joint committee will, if carried to its ultimate and logical conclusion, result in the impairment of the functioning of the standing committees of the Senate.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope the Senate will reject the amendment.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the committee amendment which is pending begins with the language starting on line 5, page 55 of the bill.

I listened with great interest to what the Senator from Wisconsin said. I notice, however, that the argument about legislation on appropriation bills seems to depend on whose ox is gored.

There are half a dozen other limitations in the bill to substantially the same effect. Just a few moments ago we adopted the committee amendment relating to the United States Employment Service, which was clearly legislation on an appropriation bill, merely because we found ourselves in such a situation that that was the only way by which the Senate had a chance to get into conference its view on the question raised.

In the matter of the organization of supervisors, I may say that I was not in Congress when the Wagner Act was passed, but I would wager that in the minds of nine-tenths of the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives who voted for that act there was never the slightest idea that foremen, who have the power to hire and fire and discipline employees, who are responsible agents of the employer, would ever be considered employees under the act. Yet, the National Labor Relations Board, in a series of 2-to-1 decisions, has so held. I think it is an impossible situation, if we want responsible management to continue in this country.

Congress passed substantive legislation by overwhelming majorities in both Houses. The bill was vetoed by the President, but in his comments on that particular provision he stated there should be legislation on the subject. It was just that we could not quite agree on a particular form.

When Congress returns next January to consider the permanent legislation which we and the President agree is needed, what if for 6 or 8 or 10 months there has been a terrific drive to organize foremen into unions, with the backing of the National Labor Relations Board, which can put an employer in jail if he does not bargain collectively with a union of foremen, or if he does not permit a foreman to join a union? If we find the foremen organized, then our legislative task will be ten times more difficult in dealing with the situation.

The pending amendment would not prohibit any foreman from joining a union. It merely provides that if he does, and if the employer does not think he can operate effectively as the employer's agent when he is in a union, the employer can discharge him, and the foreman cannot go to the National Labor Relations Board and cite the employer for an unfair labor practice.

Mr. President, that is the effect of the amendment. It freezes the situation for the next fiscal year, until Congress may have a chance to try to get together again with the President on proper legislation in this field.

I may add that in the most recent case before the National Labor Relations Board, the Jones-Laughlin case, it was held by two to one that the employers would have to bargain collectively with foremen who joined the United Mine Workers. Recently the coal mines were taken over by the President, and Secretary Krug is about to sign, if he has not signed already, an agreement forcing the foremen to join the United Mine Workers' Union.

What that particular decision does is to deprive the employer in that case of any chance ever of getting that decision into court, and that is the best decision to take to court. This whole question has never been decided by the courts. It is entirely an interpretation made by the NLRB. But once the employer signs a contract—and he will have to sign it to get his mines back—he is foreclosed from ever getting the matter into court, because the only way to do so is to defy the NLRB order, the union complains to the court, and the employer is brought into court. I think this proposal is the only fair way of holding the situation until we get another chance to consider it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this proposal, offered in committee and adopted by a majority of the committee, is undoubtedly presented in the bill with the idea of preventing the organization and establishment under law of foremen's unions. I do not think it will accomplish the result which my good friend, the able Senator from Minnesota, seeks to have accomplished. He says that during the absence of Congress there will be set up foremen's unions, and such unions will have so established themselves that it will be impossible for Congress to deal with them when it reconvenes. The amendment would not prevent the establishment of foremen's unions. The establishment of foremen's unions could go on notwithstanding the adoption of the amendment. The only thing the amendment would do would be to prohibit the application of Federal money for use with respect to any trouble arising in such unions or between them and the National Labor Relations Board. That is one thing. The amendment would not accomplish the result of retarding the organization, the existence of or the growth of unions composed of foremen if such unions are in the making now.

The question is so close, and it has been regarded as being so close, that groups and legislative committees have dealt with it in various ways. Are we now in an appropriation bill under consideration, which must be passed on this last working day of the fiscal year, going to deal haphazardly with a matter which

deserves long and careful study at the hands of legislative committees? It seems to me Mr. President, and I so stated in the committee, that this is not the time and this is not the bill on which to accomplish legislation of this kind. I hope the yeas and nays will be granted on this question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered on this question, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. ANDREWS voted "yea" when his name was called.

Mr. McCARRAN. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARRAN. A vote for the committee amendment, that is to retain the committee amendment in the bill, is a vote "yea," is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. And a vote to reject the committee amendment is a vote "nay"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there has been no answer to the roll call, has there?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; there has been a vote "yea." The clerk will proceed with the calling of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], who if present would vote "yea" on this question. I am therefore free to vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is necessarily absent.

The Senators from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO and Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent on official business, having been appointed a member of the President's Evaluation Commission in connection with the test of atomic bombs on naval vessels at Bikini.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business, having been appointed to the Commission on the part of the Senate to participate in the Philippine independence ceremonies.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State. He has a general pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

I also announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State. He has a general pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is absent on official business, having been appointed a member of the President's Evaluation Commission in connection with the test of atomic bombs on naval vessels at Bikini.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent by leave of the Senate, being a member of a committee designated by the Senate to attend the atomic bombing at Bikini.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a member of the Special Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are absent on official business, being members of the Commission appointed to attend the Philippine independence ceremonies.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is unavoidably detained.

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 34, as follows:

YEAS—31

Andrews	Gurney	Revercomb
Ball	Hart	Smith
Bridges	Hoey	Stewart
Brooks	Knowland	Swift
Burch	McClellan	Taft
Bushfield	Millikin	Wherry
Capehart	Moore	Wiley
Capper	O'Daniel	Wilson
Ferguson	Overton	Young
George	Radcliffe	
Gerry	Reed	

NAYS—34

Aiken	Huffman	Morse
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Murdock
Carville	Johnston, S. C.	Myers
Chavez	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Donnell	La Follette	Pepper
Downey	Lucas	Russell
Fulbright	McCarran	Taylor
Gossett	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Green	McMahon	Tunnell
Guffey	Magnuson	Wagner
Hayden	Mead	
Hill	Mitchell	

NOT VOTING—31

Austin	Connally	McFarland
Bailey	Cordon	Maybank
Bilbo	Eastland	Murray
Brewster	Ellender	Robertson
Briggs	Hatch	Saltonstall
Buck	Hawkes	Shipstead
Butler	Hickenlooper	Stanfill
Byrd	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Tobey	Walsh	Willis
Tydings	Wheeler	
Vandenberg	White	

So the committee amendment on page 55, lines 5 to 13, inclusive, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title V—National Mediation Board—National Railroad Adjustment Board," on page 57, line 8, after the word "services", to strike out the colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That compensation for any referee who is a public official of any Federal, State, or local government shall not be paid from this appropriation for any period of time during which any such referee is receiving compensation for his employment in any such Federal, State, or local government."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title VII—General provisions," on page 59, after line 10, to strike out section 801, as follows:

SEC. 801. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony, and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 6, to change the section number from "802" to "701."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 12, to change the section number from "803" to "702."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. I am authorized by the committee to offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 50, after line 12, it is proposed to insert the following:

Civilian war benefits: For all expenses necessary, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and travel, to enable the Federal Security Administrator, in order to continue during the fiscal year 1947 the civilian war benefits program heretofore financed from the emergency fund for the President, to provide medical and hospital care (including prosthetic

appliances and medical examinations) by contract without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, and money payments, to (a) civilians within the United States who have been injured as a result of enemy attack or of action to meet such attack or the danger thereof, or who have been injured while in the performance of their official duties as civilian defense workers; (b) civilians disabled as a result of illness, injury, or disease which occurred during detention by the enemy; and (c) the dependents within the United States of individuals injured or killed under circumstances described in clause (a) or (b) or reported as missing as a result of enemy action, $158,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I believe that this amendment should be called to the attention of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], who wished to be heard on it. I do not see him in the Chamber at present. I wonder if we can postpone action on the amendment until he has an opportunity to be present.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be temporarily passed over.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I offer another amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. I am authorized by the committee to offer this amendment.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 50, after line 12, it is proposed to insert the following:

Civilian war assistance: For all expenses necessary, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, to enable the Federal Security Administrator, in order to continue during the fiscal year 1947 the Civilian War Assistance program heretofore financed from the emergency fund for the President, to provide (a) temporary aid (including medical care by contract, transportation, and other goods and services without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, and money payments) to citizens of the United States or their children under 18 years of age who have been interned or stranded, and returned to the United States, or who have been evacuated from any area under the direction of the civil or military authorities of the United States, and (b) for the return of civilians evacuated from the Philippine Islands or Hawaii to the United States under the direction of the civil or military authorities of the United States during the period from December 7, 1941, to September 15, 1945, $5,495,000, which amount may be expended by advances or grants of funds or otherwise, to such Federal or other agencies as the Administrator may designate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I offer another amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 48, line 8, it is proposed to strike out "$575,000" and insert "$649,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to return to the amendment which was passed over temporarily. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] does not seem to be in the Chamber. I am advised by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] that the Senator from Tennessee would have no objection to the amendment if there were in it the language "citizens of the United States or their children under 18 years of age." That language is already in the amendment which has been offered.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, may the amendment be read again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be again read:

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 50, after line 12, it is proposed to insert the following:

Civilian war benefits: For all expenses necessary, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and travel, to enable the Federal Security Administrator, in order to continue during the fiscal year 1947 the civilian war benefits program heretofore financed from the emergency fund for the President, to provide medical and hospital care (including prosthetic appliances and medical examinations) by contract without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, and money payments, to (a) civilians within the United States who have been injured as a result of enemy attack or of action to meet such attack or the danger thereof, or who have been injured while in the performance of their official duties as civilian defense workers, (b) civilians disabled as a result of illness, injury, or disease which occurred during detention by the enemy, and (c) the dependents within the United States of individuals injured or killed under circumstances described in clause (a) or (b) or reported as missing as a result of enemy action, $158,000.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there is some confusion as between the two amendments. The other amendment is the one referred to by the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The other amendment has already been adopted.

Mr. McCARRAN. I will say to the Senator from New Mexico that the language to which he refers is in the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada on behalf of the committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to be clear in my own mind as to the other amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator permit the Senate to dispose of the pending amendment?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, when the item on page 50 was before the Committee on Appropriations for consideration several members of the committee objected very strenuously to the use of the words "to civilians." On my motion there was inserted, instead of the language "to civilians", the language "to citizens of the United States or their children under 18 years of age." What the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and I, and other members of the committee, would like to make sure is that that language is in the amendment adopted by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment heretofore adopted by the Senate will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 50, after line 12, it is proposed to insert the following:

Civilian war assistance: For all expenses necessary, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, to enable the Federal Security Administrator, in order to continue during the fiscal year 1947 the civilian war-assistance program heretofore financed from the emergency fund for the President, to provide (a) temporary aid (including medical care by contract, transportation, and other goods and services without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, and money payments) to citizens of the United States or their children under 18 years of age who have been interned or stranded, and returned to the United States, or who have been evacuated from any area under the direction of the civil or military authorities of the United States, and (b) for the return of civilians evacuated from the Philippine Islands or Hawaii to the United States under the direction of the civil or military authorities of the United States during the period from December 7, 1941, to September 15, 1945, $5,495,000, which amount may be expended by advances or grants of funds or otherwise, to such Federal or other agencies as the Administrator may designate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That amendment has already been adopted.

The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6739) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MEAD, Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. WHITE, Mr. BALL, and Mr. BRIDGES conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House having proceeded to reconsider the bill (H. R. 6042) entitled "An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes," returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, it was

Resolved, That the said bill do not pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives not agreeing to pass the same.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6837) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. KERR, Mr. MAHON, Mr. NORRELL, Mr. HENDRICKS, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. TIBBOTT, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL BANKRUPTCY ACT

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 6682, Calendar No. 1663. The bill was reported from the Committee on the Judiciary yesterday and is on the calendar today. It is an emergency measure. The law will expire at midnight on the 30th of this month.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6682) to amend sections 81, 82, and 83, and repeal section 84 of chapter IX of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS OF 1942

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution to extend the effective period of the emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. O'DANIEL. I object.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish Senators would withhold their objections for a moment, in order to see if we cannot reach an understanding. I realize that, the Senate being in session following a recess, the joint resolution could not be introduced without unanimous consent. If it were introduced and objection were made to its present consideration, that would, of course, postpone action on it so far as today is concerned. The joint resolution would go to the the Committee on Banking and Currency, where it would be subject to consideration and amendment, and to the same procedure as applies to any other bill or joint resolution.

If objection were made to the mere introduction of the joint resolution now, of course that would necessitate an adjournment of the Senate until the following day or until some future day, at which time we would have a morning hour, when the introduction of bills and resolutions would be called for. The joint resolution could then be introduced. If any Senator then objected to its introduction, it would have to lie over a day, and that would postpone it one more day.

I have talked to the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee and to other members of the committee. Some of them seemed to be fearful that if the Senator from New York were permitted to introduce his joint resolution today, an immediate call would be sent out to the members of the committees to hold a meeting of the committee, and they would meet and would try to report the joint resolution to the Senate today.

I can assure all Senators that the Senator from New York, the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, has no intention of calling a meeting of the committee before Monday, at which time the joint resolution would be subject to all the rules and regulations which apply to any other measure.

Therefore, it would seem to me that no point would be gained by objecting to the introduction of the joint resolution today, because at best the joint resolution could not be adopted today. I have frankly stated to everyone concerned that there is no human possibility of the Senate enacting any legislation on the subject between now and midnight tomorrow night, so the OPA law would lapse, anyway. Regardless of whether it lapsed for 1 day or for 2 days or for a week, new action on the part of the Congress would be required, the time when that action would be taken would be a matter of conjecture, and would make no serious difference.

So, Mr. President, I hope Senators will not object to the introduction of the joint resolution today. If the Senator from New York were to seek immediate consideration of the joint resolution, I realize that objection would be made.

But I hope Senators will permit the joint resolution to be introduced today and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and thus let the committee on Monday take whatever action it may see fit to take.

I may say that I have urged that no snap judgment be taken by the committee today, because with so many members of the committee out of town it is felt that no fair judgment would be obtainable.

So I hope no objection will be made to the introduction of the joint resolution today.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I have the greatest respect and admiration for our majority leader. From what he says, and I believe him unqualifiedly, it appears that no action would be taken before the OPA Act expired on Sunday at midnight on the joint resolution proposed to be introduced by the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

Mr. BARKLEY. I say to the Senator from Texas that no action could be taken on it before Monday. It is just a question of timing, a question as to when it could be taken up.

But there is no use for us to "kid" ourselves, and I have no desire to "kid" either the Senate or the country. There is no humanly possible way by which action could be taken by Sunday night.

So, under the circumstances, I see nothing much to be gained by objecting to the introduction today of the joint resolution of the Senator from New York, and to letting it go to the Banking and Currency Committee. The only difference would be the time when the joint resolution could be introduced.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I think I have made it plain that I am against the OPA.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I got that impression the other night. [Laughter.]

Mr. O'DANIEL. I saw very little opportunity to cause the OPA to expire, but I hoped and prayed that it would expire, and I did everything I could do to bring about that result. Now, with the help of the President, it looks as if it has come about.

However, I am inclined to believe that we have had help from on high; we have had help from God, as well as from man, on this matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Bible says that the prayers of the righteous availeth much. But we might enter into a long debate here as to who is or who is not righteous. [Laughter.]

I hope, however, the Senator will not object to the introduction today of the joint resolution, because by objecting he will not gain any time or advantage.

Mr. O'DANIEL. All I would lose would be the honor of objecting to the introduction of the joint resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The joint resolution would provide, would it not, for a continuation of the present OPA Act?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. If objection is made, that will mean that the OPA Act will die at midnight tomorrow. But if before that time a continuing joint resolution is introduced, that will be before the Banking and Currency Committee, and it might be amended so as to continue in force the present OPA Act. Otherwise a new act will be required.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me say that the mere introduction of a joint resolution continuing a law does not continue it. The joint resolution has to be acted upon by the Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. But it holds out to the President and to those who favor the OPA the hope that there will be a continuation of it.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I do not think it holds out any hope of any kind.

Mr. WHERRY. I do.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no use in trying to see spooks which do not exist. There is no way to prevent the introduction of the joint resolution either today or Monday. If it is introduced on Monday, it still will have to be referred to the committee, and in the meantime the OPA law will have expired at midnight on the previous Sunday. If the joint resolution is introduced today, it will have to go to the committee, and the OPA law will expire at midnight on Sunday, anyway.

So I see nothing to be gained by objecting to the introduction of the joint resolution today.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. What particular advantage would there be to the opponents of the joint resolution as between objecting now or objecting later to the introduction of the joint resolution?

Mr. BARKLEY. It is hard to say whether there would be any advantage or disadvantage to either side.

There is this to be said: If permission is given for the introduction of the joint resolution today and its reference to the Committee on Banking and Currency, the committee could be called into meeting on some day next week, not earlier than Monday.

Mr. MOORE. It could be called into meeting today.

Mr. BARKLEY. It could be, but it will not be.

Mr. MOORE. Well, I object.

Mr. BARKLEY. A meeting of the committee will not be called today. If the Senator cannot rely upon my assurance on that subject——

Mr. MOORE. No; I do not want to deceive anyone at all. I wish to see this thing die. The Senator from Kentucky knows that.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I gathered that impression also from the Senator. But it will die. It will be just as dead on Monday morning if this joint resolution is introduced today, as it will be if the joint resolution is not introduced until Monday. That is the truth about it.

Mr. MOORE. That may be perfectly true, but I still have not had an answer to the question why it would be a favor to allow the joint resolution to be introduced today.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then it would be pending before the Banking and Currency Committee, so that the chairman of the committee could call a meeting of the committee for Monday, if he wished to have the committee meet on Monday, or he could call a meeting for Tuesday. I imagine he would try to call the meeting for Monday.

If the joint resolution is introduced on Monday, the Senator from New York could still call a meeting of the committee that afternoon, if he saw fit to do so. But I will say to the Senator that it would be more convenient to permit the introduction of the joint resolution now and let it be referred to the committee, rather than to have to adjourn the Senate from now until Monday in order to have a morning hour, and then have the Senate spend 2 hours in the morning hour, in order that the Senator from New York might introduce his joint resolution on Monday. That is about the only difference.

I say to the Senator that regardless of whether the joint resolution is introduced today or is introduced on Monday, he will lose no advantage which he would have after the expiration of the OPA law.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, the majority leader said before, and I noticed it carefully and I read it in the RECORD again, that if the extending joint resolution is introduced, then it will be open to amendment and there can be attached to it the conference report or any other provision which it may be desired to attach to it.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is absolutely correct, and that is true either as to the committee or as to the Senate. In other words, the joint resolution is a simple joint resolution continuing the operation of the OPA Act. If the joint resolution never is enacted, of course the OPA Act never is revived, and it remains dead.

But the joint resolution could be amended in the committee. A majority of the committee could add to the joint resolution the bill which the President has just vetoed. The committee could make it even worse, if a majority of the committee preferred something worse. Or it could make it better.

But no matter what the committee did, the joint resolution still would be open to amendment in the Senate, and it would be up to the Senate to decide what sort of joint resolution it would pass, or whether it would agree to pass any.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I take it that the real question which confronts us is whether we shall now by unanimous consent permit the introduction of the joint resolution, or whether the Senator from New York as a matter of right will introduce the joint resolution on Monday.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct; that is really about all there is to it.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. The OPA Act is now in effect.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is; yes.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Therefore, a resolution known as a continuing resolution would be properly named.

If the OPA Act expires at midnight on Sunday night, how could a continuing joint resolution be introduced on Monday?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, that is what an old colored man down in my section of the country called a "technimicality. [Laughter.]

Of course, the Banking and Currency Committee could correct that by saying it was a reviving joint resolution, instead of a continuing joint resolution. But that is not very important.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I am sure that when the Senator from Kentucky said there was no human means or no technical way by which the joint resolution could be passed today, he meant if objection were made. But I think we should let the country know, and I think the Senate should indicate, that it is aware that we could handle this joint resolution in the same way we handled the draft joint resolution a little while ago. All of us remember that when the draft law was about to expire, a joint resolution providing for its continuation for a limited time was introduced on the floor of the Senate; and in a matter of minutes the Senate passed the joint resolution continuing the Selective Service Act.

If no objection were made, the rules of the Senate would not prevent us from taking up this matter immediately and debating it and discussing it for as long as we chose to do so, and then having a fair and full vote on it in the Senate.

So I am sure the Senator from Kentucky meant to say that if objection were made we could not take up the joint resolution today, but if objection were not made we could take up and pass the joint resolution this very afternoon by having a fair and full vote on it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I am fully aware of the possibility which the Senator from Florida has pointed out. When I said it was not humanly or, perhaps, practically possible to pass the joint resolution today or by midnight tomorrow night, I took into consideration the practical situation. I knew that Senators would object to immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

I am only seeking to have the joint resolution introduced and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. No Senator will lose any right he possesses by not objecting to the introduction of the joint resolution at this time.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Will the Senator please explain the reason, if any, why the joint resolution could not be referred to the committee and the committee act on it this afternoon?

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no reason why, if the committee were called and the majority of the committee were willing to pass on the resolution, it could not be passed on today. In fact, the resolution could be acted upon. I have been told by the chairman of the committee, however, that the committee will not be called this afternoon, and I, myself, have urged that the committee be not called. I think I can assure the Senator that the committee will not be called this afternoon, but physically it could be called. If a majority of the members of the committee were willing to act on the resolution, they could act, but that will not take place.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I appreciate what the Senator has said, but I wish to interpose my objection just the same.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] has already objected.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I was the first to object.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; but I thought perhaps I could make some headway. [Laughter.]

Mr. O'DANIEL. The Senator has made some headway, but I want it to be known that I was the Senator who objected first.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well. I believe the RECORD will show that the Senator from Texas was the first to object.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I appreciate the way the majority leader has cooperated with me.

Mr. BARKLEY. I believe that the word "cooperated" is a misnomer. I have not cooperated with the Senator in his

attitude on this legislation. I did cooperate with him the other night when I was trying to see that he received an opportunity to say what he had to say.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I was referring to that cooperation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was hoping that, by cooperating with me at this time, the Senator from Texas would accord me a little reciprocity in return for the cooperation which I gave him the other night.

Mr. O'DANIEL. If I could see any point to be gained by not objecting to this proposal, I might consider giving to the Senator a little more cooperation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know that I am in agreement that the Senator would have any advantage in not objecting, or in objecting. I do not believe that there would be any advantage to be gained either way.

Mr. O'DANIEL. That is why I wanted to have the honor of objecting.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator regards that as a vital matter in his public life, I shall not withhold the honor from him.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I certainly do regard it as being vital, because I had no hope of winning the battle when I started in the fight.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has recruited some powerful influences since he spoke. [Laughter.]

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes; but as I have said, I have been praying that this would come about, because I know the Lord moves in mysterious ways His wonders to perform.

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, He has certainly performed wonderfully in this case. [Laughter.]

Mr. O'DANIEL. He certainly has. He has enabled the American people to move in a wonderful style.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, as I understand it, the Lord is not compelled to accept the partnership if He does not want to.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I present the conference report on House bill 8496, the naval appropriation bill for 1947. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6496) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6, 13, 26, 57, 63, 65, 69, and 70.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25, 27, 28, 33, 34, 46, 58, 60, and 61, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$13,844,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment and at the end of the matter so restored insert the following: "or who have not been commissioned in the line of the Navy more than five years prior to the commencement of such educational courses or postgraduate instruction"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "$246,390,000, of which $350,000 shall be available for placing the equipment at the Naval Torpedo Station, Newport, Rhode Island, in condition for operation"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "not to exceed $500,000,000 from the naval stock fund: *Provided*, That the cash working capital of the naval stock fund shall not be reduced below $50,000,000 as the result of such transfer", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$70,966,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$131,018,300; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$370,558,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,239,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$325,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$706,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,271,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$354,412,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,785,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$15,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$17,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$57,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$275,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,642,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$31,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,425,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$967,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,626,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$383,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$6,140,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,456,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,705,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,075,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,045,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,715,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$35,562,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "September"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "August"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "September"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "September"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 12, 19, 59, and 62.

JOHN H. OVERTON,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
DAVID I. WALSH,
STYLES BRIDGES,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr.,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ALBERT THOMAS,
THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
WALTER C. PLOESER,
NOBLE J. JOHNSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, I wish to propound a question to the Senator from Louisiana with regard to amendment No. 10 in the conference report. I refer to the amendment which was carried by 2 votes in the Senate. The bill as it passed the House required that no funds under the act should be available for the manufacturing, assembling, repairing, or overhauling of torpedoes at Forest Park, Ill.

Was a vote taken on the amendment in the conferenece? Was a separate vote taken?

Mr. OVERTON. The House conferees receded on the amendment. It was not necessary for the Senate conferees to take any vote.

Mr. GERRY. Was any request made that a vote be taken?

Mr. OVERTON. Not on the part of the Senate conferees, as I recall. The amendment was a Senate amendment, and the House receded.

Mr. GERRY. Yes, but there were Senators who were interested in the amendment, and I should like to know if any of the conferees asked that a vote be taken on the amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. No. There was no necessity of any vote being taken, so far as the conferees on the part of the Senate were concerned, because the amendment was a Senate amendment. The House receded.

Mr. GERRY. The House receded?

Mr. OVERTON. Yes.

Mr. GERRY. Was there any debate on the matter before the conferees on the part of the House receded?

Mr. OVERTON. Not in connection with this amendment. There was debate in connection with another amendment.

Mr. GERRY. Which amendment?

Mr. OVERTON. The amendment which was inserted namely, that $350,000 shall be available for placing the equipment at the naval torpedo station, Newport, R. I., in condition for operation. There was some talk about that amendment.

Mr. GERRY. There was no talk with reference to the Forand amendment?

Mr. OVERTON. No.

Mr. GERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Speaking on the same subject matter which was raised by the able Senator from Rhode Island, I note that there still remains in the naval appropriations bill the $350,000 appropriation for placing the equipment at the naval torpedo station, Newport, R. I., in condition for operation. Am I to understand that, by leaving that appropriation in the bill, it is still discretionary with the Navy, under the language of the bill, to open up the torpedo plant in Newport, R. I., or leave it just as it is?

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, that is a matter of interpretation. The senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] took the position that this language would, in his opinion, at least as I understood him, require the Navy Department to resume the manufacture of torpedoes at Newport. I took an opposite view. It is my interpretation that the matter is left entirely within the discretion of the Navy. The Navy may use the money for such purpose at Newport as the Navy Department determines to be necessary or proper. The Navy may continue research work there, or abandon it. The Navy may continue the testing of torpedoes there or abandon the testing of torpedoes. I may say further that the Navy may manufacture torpedoes there or not manufacture them.

Mr. LUCAS. I believe that the able Senator is correct in his interpretation. There is no definite time stated in the amendment with reference to when the $350,000 shall be spent.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his explanation.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, under the form of the report would it be possible to construct new hospitals?

Mr. OVERTON. Yes; it will be possible to construct new hospitals.

The PRESIDING OFFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report submitted by the Senator from Louisiana.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the message announcing the action of the House of Representatives on certain amendments in disagreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 6496, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
June 29, 1946.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 59 to the bill (H. R. 6496) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In line 3 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment strike out "and";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert: "*: Provided further*, That wherever there are architectural and engineering services in any State in which a project is located qualified tc do the work, such services shall be utilized"; and

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 120. The Secretary of the Navy may delegate to the commandants of the naval districts, for administration within their respective districts, his authority to authorize payment of the expenses of the transfer of household goods of employees, and of the costs of transportation of their immediate families on change from one official duty station to another."

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 12, 19, and 62.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, has the conference report been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been agreed to.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recorded as against the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the reports of the

committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 4512. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research relating to psychiatric disorders and to aid in the development of more effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of such disorders, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5244. An act to authorize the appointment of additional Foreign Service officers in the classified grades.

PROGRAM FOR MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on Monday next at 12 o'clock the two Houses of Congress are to assemble in joint session for memorial exercises in honor of the late President Roosevelt. The House has advised me that it wishes the Senate to be in the Chamber of the House at not later than 11:45 o'clock a. m. Therefore it will be necessary for us to assemble at 11 o'clock Monday, and when we have concluded the business of the Senate today it will be my purpose to move to adjourn until 11 o'clock Monday morning, so that we may have ample time to assemble and go to the House Chamber, in the meantime transacting any preliminary business in the morning hour prior to our departure for the House.

EXTENSION OF PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS OF 1942

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. In view of objection having been made a few moments ago when the Senator from New York, with other Senators, proposed to introduce a joint resolution for the continuation of OPA, I wish to ask whether, if the Senator were now to tender the joint resolution and objection were made, and there should be an adjournment of the Senate terminating the legislative day of March 5, in which we now are, it would be possible for the joint resolution to be offered subsequent to the adjournment, if the Senate reconvened after the adjournment on the same calendar day in which we now are?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Paragraph 1 of rule XIV provides, under the heading "Bills, joint resolutions, and resolutions," that if objection is made, it cannot be done.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Chair tell me to what section of the rule he refers?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be found in the rules on page 18, rule XIV, paragraph 5 of which provides:

All resolutions shall lie over 1 day for consideration, unless by unanimous consent the Senate shall otherwise direct.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am not speaking about how long a resolution shall lie over once it comes from a committee or once it is offered. I am speaking about the possibility of introducing the resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sure the Chair will corroborate the statement I am about to make. Under the rules, during the morning hour, no matter whether that morning hour takes place from 12 to 2 o'clock or at 5 o'clock in the afternoon, a bill or resolution may be offered, and if objection is interposed, it has to lie over for 1 day before it can be introduced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. That has nothing to do with whether it has been reported from a committee. It means the mere offer of a resolution or bill during the morning hour. If objection is made, it must lie over for 24 hours, or to another day. As a rule that is not done, but that does not vitiate the rule, and if any Senator objected, it would have to go over.

For instance, if I should move that the Senate adjourn for 30 minutes this afternoon, and we met at the end of that period, we will say, and had a morning hour, and the Senator from New York offered his joint resolution and objection were made to its introduction, it would have to go over until Monday, at which time it could be introduced.

Therefore I have no purpose to have a brief recess or adjournment this afternoon, because nothing would be accomplished. It seems to me that there is no point in undertaking to do that, and I have no intention of doing it, because the joint resolution could not be introduced before Monday, at best. I have no doubt that when on Monday morning we reach the order, during the morning hour, for the introduction of bills, this joint resolution will be introduced and take its course before the Senate that other bills and resolutions take.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has correctly stated the rule. If a recess or adjournment should now be taken and the Senate reassembled in an hour, the same objection could be made to the introduction of the joint resolution that was made earlier today.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Chair will allow me to make a suggestion, I have before me section 1 of rule XIV, which no doubt the Chair had in mind in making the ruling he indicated. The section reads:

Whenever a bill or joint resolution shall be offered, its introduction shall, if objected to, be postponed for 1 day.

I make the parliamentary inquiry of the Chair as to whether that one day means a calendar day or a legislative day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It means a legislative day.

Mr. PEPPER. That is what I thought. We are presently in the legislative day of March 5, are we not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. If we were to adjourn, would not that end that legislative day, and if we were to reconvene, would we not reconvene in another legislative day?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That much is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. If that be true, then, if the joint resolution had been tendered in the legislative day of March 5, and an adjournment terminated the legislative day of March 5, and brought about a new day, when we reconvened would it not be possible for the resolution at that time to be introduced, there being another legislative day after the day when it was first offered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The tendering of it has not anything to do with it. Objection was made when it was tendered; therefore that is obliterated. The fact of taking an adjournment would not change the situation. The same objection could be made again.

Mr. PEPPER. If there were to be an adjournment terminating the legislative day of March 5, and the Senate were to reconvene, then that would put the morning hour back into effect, would it not, and the introduction of bills or resolutions would be permitted when that part of the morning hour was reached?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it would not be permitted if any objection were made, and if objection were made, though we were in a new legislative day, the resolution would have to lie over for another day. That is the rule, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator from New York offered his resolution today, and objection were made, he could not offer it during the following day and satisfy the rule?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Today it is not offered under the rule at all.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand the parliamentary situation, in the event the joint resolution is offered, even on Monday, and an objection is made to its being offered, it would have to lie over until Tuesday before it could even be referred to the committee?

Mr. BARKLEY. It would have to lie over for one legislative day before it could be introduced and referred to a committee.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to make one more inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. That being true, if we were to have an adjournment and a reconvening of the Senate today, and then the joint resolution were offered, when the Senate reconvened on that new legislative day, then at least the resolution could be introduced on Monday instead of on Tuesday, could it not? We would save a day if we did that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would have to lie over a day, and, of course, its introduction could not be acted upon Monday.

Mr. PEPPER. But this is my question: We are now in the legislative day of March 5, and if we should adjourn in 15 minutes and then reconvene 15 minutes after we adjourned, that would constitute a new legislative day. Then there would be a morning hour, and if the Senator from New York should offer his joint resolution and objection were made, at least he could introduce it the next time the Senate convened.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He could offer it on Monday again.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; but as it is now, if we do not adjourn, if we go over until Monday and he offered it on Monday,

and objection were made, he could not introduce it until Tuesday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would lie over 1 day.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the only way by which the joint resolution could be finally introduced today and referred to a committee, under the circumstances, would be for us to adjourn for a brief season and then return after the adjournment, at some hour to be fixed in the motion for adjournment, at which time we would have a morning hour, and the Chair would call for the introduction of bills and resolutions. If objection were made, then in order to get the resolution introduced at any time today, we would have to take another adjournment, and I doubt whether we could take two legislative adjournments in one calendar day. I should like to inquire of the Chair whether the Senate can adjourn twice in the same calendar day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that that cannot be done.

Mr. BARKLEY. So that we could not by taking a second adjournment, bring about the possibility of the joint resolution being introduced today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. So that it would have to go over until Monday in any event.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that in all likelihood there will be no objection to its introduction Monday if the resolution is proffered, because no point could be gained by objection. I cannot guarantee that, of course, because I am not in the confidence of any Senator who might feel like objecting, but I see no point to be gained in a further objection on Monday to the introduction of the resolution.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. If we should adjourn within a half hour and have a new legislative day, this resolution could then be offered. However, objection then would mean that it would go over until another legislative day. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MYERS. If the Senate should meet on Sunday, the resolution could be offered on Sunday and we could meet and consider it. Am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It could be read only one time. If any Senator objected it could not possibly be considered that day.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the rule requires that a bill or joint resolution having been finally introduced must be read on three different days, so if objection were made and it were finally introduced on Sunday, it would have to be read once on Sunday, and once on Monday, and it could not possibly be referred to the committee until Monday, and could not possibly be considered until Tuesday, even if the Senate met on Sunday; it could not be ready for consideration by that time, anyway.

Mr. MYERS. By following that procedure, however, Mr. President, we might be assured consideration of the joint resolution on Monday, while if there were objection made each day and three objections were made in all, it might be Thursday or Friday before consideration could be secured.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There would be no possible way of the Senate considering the joint resolution before the time stated.

PROVISION FOR SECONDARY MARKETS FOR FARM LOANS GUARANTEED BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on page 9 of the calendar will be found Senate bill 2280, Calendar No. 1541. It is necessary that this bill be passed as soon as possible in order that the banks may sell their mortgages to the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation so as to enable them to use again their capital for financing loans guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended. A bottleneck exists at the present time due to the fact that the small banks, especially, throughout the country are loaded up with mortgages which they cannot liquidate. They want to get rid of some of those loans, and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation has the money and wants to lend it, due to the fact that recently the farmers have not desired to borrow as much money as they wanted to borrow a few years ago.

The Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation desires the law amended to permit the Corporation to purchase such loans, just as it has purchased other agricultural credit paper through the Federal Land Bank in the past. The bill was considered by the Banking and Currency Committee, which had hearings on it, and the committee approved the bill unanimously.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Is the Senator desiring consideration of Senate bill 2280, which is Calendar No. 1541?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I will say that that bill was unanimously agreed to by the Banking and Currency Committee and reported to the Senate by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE]. I am sure there can be no objection to its enactment.

Mr. WHITE. I have talked with certain members of the minority on the Banking and Currency Committee, and they have no objection to the passage of the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I will say that as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee I hope the bill will be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2280) to amend the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act to provide a secondary market for farm loans made under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 (b) of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 1020d), is amended by inserting after the first sentence of said section the following new sentence: "The Corporation is further authorized to purchase from approved lenders, for cash, loans made under section 502 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (Public Law 346, 78th Cong.), as amended, for such prices and upon such terms and conditions as the Board of Directors of the Corporation finds appropriate to effectuate the purposes of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944."

SIMPLIFICATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF CREDIT SERVICES TO FARMERS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1353, House bill 5991, which I discussed yesterday afternoon. The House has passed one bill relating to the Farm Security Administration and the Senate passed another bill which is now in the House. In the bill now on the Senate calendar the Senate committee struck out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and substituted the Senate bill. Passage of this bill will enable the conferees to deal with the contents of both bills in an effort to reach some legislation in regard to this important service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. As I understand, this is a bill against which there has been some objection urged by two or three Senators on the minority side, but I also understand that they have yielded their opposition and are in approval with the Senator's efforts to have the bill passed at this time.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think there is some opposition to the bill, perhaps, Mr. President, but I have made a unanimous-consent request that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Georgia?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5991) to simplify and improve credit services to farmers and promote farm ownership by abolishing certain agricultural lending agencies and functions, by transferring assets to the Farmers' Home Corporation, by enlarging the powers of the Farmers' Home Corporation, by authorizing Government insurance of loans to farmers, by creating preferences for loans and insured mortgages to enable veterans to acquire farms, by providing additional specific authority and directions with respect to the liquidation of resettlement projects and rural rehabilitation projects for resettlement purposes, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment

to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That section 1 (a) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, is hereby further amended by deleting the last word "farms", inserting a comma after the word "acquire", and adding the following: "repair, or improve family-type farms, to enlarge undersized farms, or to refinance indebtedness against undersized or underimproved farm units when loans are being made by the Secretary to enlarge or improve such units. Loans may also be made to assist borrowers under this title in making the repairs and improvements needed to adjust their farming operations to changing conditions."

Section 1 (b) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"Any veterans (defined herein as a person who served in the land or naval forces of the United States after December 6, 1941, and who shall have been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable) who is found by the Secretary by reason of his ability and experience, including training as a vocational trainee, to be likely to carry out successfully undertakings required of him under a loan which may be made under this title shall be eligible for the benefits of this title to the same extent as if he were a farm tenant. Except with respect to veterans, only farm tenants, farm laborers, sharecroppers, and other individuals who obtain, or who recently obtained, the major portion of their income from farming operations shall be eligible to receive the benefits of this title. In making available the benefits of this title, the Secretary shall give preference to persons who are married, or who have dependent families, or, wherever practicable, to persons who are able to make an initial down payment, or who are owners of livestock and farm implements necessary successfully to carry on farming operations. No person shall be eligible who is not a citizen of the United States."

Section 1 (c) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is amended to read as follows:

"No loan shall be made for the acquisition, improvement, or enlargement of any farm unless such farm will be of such size and type as the Secretary determines to be sufficient to constitute an efficient family-type farm-management unit and to enable a diligent farm family to carry on successful farming of a type which the Secretary deems can be successfully carried on in the locality in which the farm is situated: *Provided*, That loans may be made to veterans, as defined in section 1 (b) hereof, who have pensionable disabilities, to enable such veterans to acquire, enlarge, repair, or improve farm units of sufficient size to meet the farming capabilities of such veterans and afford them income which, together with their pensions, will enable them to meet living and operating expenses and the amounts due on their loans."

Section 3 (a) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is amended to read as follows:

"Loans made under this title shall be in such amount (not in excess of the value of the farm as certified by the County Committee) as may be necessary to enable the borrower to acquire or enlarge the farm or to make the necessary repairs and improvements thereon, and shall be secured by a first mortgage or deed of trust on the farm. Loans may not be made for the acquisition or enlargement of farms which have a value, as required, enlarged, or improved, in excess of the average value of efficient family-type farm-management units, as determined by the Secretary, in the county, parish, or locality where the farm is located."

Section 4 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is amended by designating the present language as subsection "(a)", changing the period at the end of such subsection to a colon, and adding the following: "*Provided*, That there may be distributed in any fiscal year to each State or Territory such amount not in excess of $100,000 as is determined by the Secretary to be necessary to finance loans in such State or Territory under this title.

"(b) Special appropriations for the benefit of veterans may be allocated equitably among the several States on the basis of need, as determined by the Secretary, without reference to the formulae set forth in subsection (a) hereof."

Section 6 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is amended to read as follows:

"To carry out the provisions of this title, there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $50,000,000 for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and such further sums as may be necessary for administrative expenses in carrying out this title during such fiscal year."

Title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is further amended by the insertion of a new section 7 immediately following section 6, to read:

"SEC. 7. Sums heretofore appropriated or otherwise made available hereunder shall be subject only to the limitations contained in this title, as amended."

Section 21 (a) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

"Grants may also be made to such eligible individuals, where necessary to aid in their rehabilitation, and to cooperative associations furnishing medical, dental, or hospital services to such individuals."

Section 21 (c) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is amended to read:

"There are eligible for the benefits of this title (1) veterans, as defined in section 1 (b) hereof, who desire the practical guidance in farm and home operations supplied by the Farm Security Administration to its borrowers, and (2) farm owners, farm tenants, farm laborers, sharecroppers, and other individuals who obtain, or who recently obtained, the major portion of their income from farming operations, and who cannot obtain the necessary financing elsewhere at reasonable rates and terms."

Section 23 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is amended to read:

"There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as the Congress shall from time to time determine to be necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out the purposes of this title."

Section 41 (g) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma and adding the following immediately thereafter: "including the release from personal liability, without payment of further consideration, of—

"(1) borrowers who have transferred their farms to other approved applicants under agreements assuming the outstanding indebtedness to the Secretary under this title; and

"(2) borrowers who have transferred their farms to other approved applicants under agreements assuming that portion of their outstanding indebtedness to the Secretary which is equal to the earning capacity value of the farm at the time of the transfer, and borrowers whose farms have been acquired by the Secretary, in cases where the county committees certify and the Secretary determines that the borrowers have cooperated in good faith with the Secretary, have farmed in a workmanlike manner, used due diligence to maintain the security against loss, and otherwise fulfilled the covenants incident to their loans, to the best of their abilities."

Section 42 (b) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is amended to read:

"Each member of the committee shall be allowed compensation at the rate of not to exceed $5 per day while engaged in the performance of duties under this act. The number of days per month that such members may be paid shall be determined and approved by the Secretary. In addition, they shall be allowed such amounts as the Secretary may prescribe for necessary traveling and subsistence expenses."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to better adapt the loan programs authorized by the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to the needs of veterans and low-income farmers, and for other purposes."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will appoint the conferees later.

SATURDAY HOLIDAYS FOR DISTRICT BANKS AND BUILDING-AND-LOAN ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there is on the calendar Docket No. 1531, Senate bill 2307, a bill to provide that every Saturday shall be a holiday for banks and building-and-loan associations in the District of Columbia. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. The bill has been approved by the Commissioners of the District; it has been approved by the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, and it has also been approved by the District of Columbia Committee of the House. All the bill does is to provide that every Saturday shall be a holiday for banks and building-and-loan associations in the District of Columbia.

Mr. BARKLEY. The bill applies only to the District of Columbia?

Mr. McCARRAN. It applies only to the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2307) to provide that every Saturday shall be a holiday for banks and building-and-loan associations in the District of Columbia, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the fourth sentence of section 1389 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D. C. Code, 1940 ed., sec. 28–616), is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That every Saturday shall be a holiday in the District and not a business day for (1) every bank or banking institution having an office or banking house located within the District, (2) every Federal savings and loan association whose main office is in the District, and (3) every building association, building and loan association, or savings and loan association, incorporated or unincorporated, organized and operating under the laws of and having an office located within the District; and any act which would otherwise be required, authorized, or permitted to be performed on Saturday in the District at the office or banking house of, or

by, any such bank or banking institution, Federal savings and loan association, building association, building and loan association, or savings and loan association, if Saturday were not a holiday, shall or may be so performed on the next succeeding business day, and no liability or loss of rights of any kind shall result from such delay."

DISTRIBUTION AND UTILIZATION OF HEALTH PERSONNEL, FACILITIES, AND RELATED SERVICES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Resolution 244, which is on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 244) further increasing the limit of expenditures for a study and survey of the distribution and utilization of health personnel, facilities, and related services, submitted by Mr. PEPPER on March 22, 1946, and reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, with an amendment at the end of the resolution to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$40,000."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move to amend the committee amendment in line 5 by striking out "$40,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "$5,000; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the authority heretofore granted by Senate Resolution 74, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to June 2, 1946, and as continued from time to time, shall be terminated August 1, 1946", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 74, Seventy-eighth Congress (providing for study and survey of the distribution and utilization of health personnel, facilities, and related services), agreed to June 2, 1943, is hereby increased by $5,000; be it further

Resolved, That the authority heretofore granted by Senate Resolution 74, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to June 2, 1943, and as continued from time to time, shall be terminated August 1, 1946.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] a question. Is that the amendment on which we had an agreement?

Mr. PEPPER. That is the amendment which the Senator from Nebraska agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not hear the amendment read. It seems to me that the figure "$10,000" was read. Was that the original language?

Mr. PEPPER. No; the original language was "$40,000," but the amendment cuts the amount to $5,000. The amendment is in the exact language to which the Senator agreed.

Mr. WHERRY. Our understanding is now that the amount of money appropriated under the amendment is $5,000, and that the authority heretofore granted shall be terminated on August 1, 1946.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the resolution.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 1654. An act to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3517. An act to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to India, and persons of races indigenous to the Philippine Islands, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4512. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research relating to psychiatric disorders and to aid in the development of more effective methods of pevention, diagnosis, and treatment of such disorders, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5244. An act to authorize the appointment of additional foreign service officers in the classified grades;

H. R. 5716. An act to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended;

H. R. 6335. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6429. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6516. An act to increase the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

SUPREME COURT, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Louis LeBaron, of Hawaii, to be associate justice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hon. Bunk Gardner, of Kentucky, to be United States district judge, Canal Zone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hon. George B. Harris, of California, to be United States district judge, northern district of California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

IN THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the nominations on the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND RECEIVE COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the President of the Senate be authorized to sign enrolled bills during the adjournment of the Senate, and that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive communications from the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADMISSION OF COLORED REPORTERS TO UNITED STATES SENATE AND HOUSE PRESS GALLERIES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks a resolution which was introduced and passed at the recent convention of the American Newspaper Guild, which pertains to representation in the press galleries of the House and Senate by newspaper men of the colored race.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCRANTON, PA.—The weight of the 25,000 members of the American Newspaper Guild was thrown behind the fight of colored reporters for admission to the United States Senate and House press galleries here on Friday, June 21, when delegates to the thirteenth national ANG convention unanimously passed a resolution condemning racial discrimination in congressional press galleries.

Drafted by Lowell Lomax, reporter for the Washington Afro-American, and only Negro member of the 10-man District of Columbia delegation, the resolution calls on the ANG to protest this outrageous injustice to millions of American citizens.

Introduced at the convention by the Washington delegation of the ANG, the resolution reads as follows:

"Whereas the 13,000,000 Negro citizens of the United States have no duly accredited representative in the press galleries of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States, thus depriving these citizens of direct access to news of their Government, and whereas the Negro press, still in its infancy, has more than 1,000,000 subscribers who are entitled to correspondents cognizant of their particular interests and problems: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the American Newspaper Guild protest this outrageous injustice to millions of American citizens; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the International Executive Board of the ANG and all guild locals appeal to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and members of the Rules Committee of the Senate to take appropriate action so that correspondents of this great

segment of the American press are welcomed to the press galleries of the House of Representatives and the Senate; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Guild officers be instructed to make a proper presentation of the action of this convention to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Rules Committee of the Senate and the chairman of the Standing Committee of Correspondents of the House and Senate Press Galleries."

After motion for adoption of the resolution was made on the floor of the convention, Lowell Lomax of the Washington delegation arose to denounce the discriminatory racial policies in the congressional press galleries and to urge the unanimous adoption of the motion.

Enthusiastic applause greeted Mr. Lomax at the conclusion of his speech on the press gallery resolution before the 250 delegates in the ballroom of Scranton's Hotel Casey.

Edward Talty, staff reporter on the Washington Times-Herald and Harry Read of the National CIO Committee to Abolish Discrimination also spoke in support of the resolution.

Other members of the Washington delegation who endorsed the resolution were William Flythe, Times-Herald; Philip J. Austensen, Post reporter and president of the Washington Newspaper Guild.

Mrs. Mary Spargo, Washington Post; S. Paul Hoffman, Post; John McLeod, Daily News; Quenten Mott, Evening Star, and Milton Murray, International President of the American Newspaper Guild.

REORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS—EDITORIAL COMMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD several editorials which I hold in my hand, which are in support of the bill which seeks to reorganize the Congress.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register Guard of June 19, 1946]

TIME OUT FOR REPAIRS

The Senate, which has been trying rather desperately to cope with most of the Nation's pressing ills all at once, took time out the other day for a little self-improvement. The result was a bill reorganizing and streamlining congressional procedure which is excellent as far as it goes. And it goes quite a long way.

The senators discarded one or two mossy, cherished traditions, and it must have wrung some of the older, more conservative hearts to do so. But they voted themselves and their colleagues in the House a $5000-a-year salary increase by way of heart balm.

They also provided some generous social security which will permit them to retire with dignity and a pension after 62 years upon this earth, provided that six of those years were spent in Congress. To enlarge upon the wisdom of that move might lead to some unflattering examples. So perhaps it is enough to say that the pension appears to be a wise investment.

Among the reorganization bill's chief virtues are a reduction in the number of committees, expert assistance for appropriations committees, enough money to hire capable help for other administrative and research duties, and the registering of lobbyists.

A lot of Senators have enjoyed the power, prestige and importance of many committee memberships. But they really pay for their enjoyment in hard work. Besides answering their mail, having their ears bent by constituents, understanding all current legislation, being on the floor for debate and voting, they are also at present supposed to be experts on all the various, complex specialized subjects which they have to wrestle with in a half dozen committees to which they may belong.

It is just too much to do efficiently. Besides, the same general legislative subject may slop over into two or three different committees, all of which adds to the confusion, delay, and red tape.

As for appropriations, Congress has generally had to take an executive department's word for what it needed and why. The members have been busy enough without endeavoring to fathom the inner workings of outside agencies. Consequently, they have approved or slashed budgets through ignorance, caprice, benevolence and sheer cussedness. Provision for expert assistants will give the committees some boys on their side whom they can trust, and who presumably will know what they're talking about.

The new bill should ease group pressures not only through registration and financial accountability of lobbies, but by the establishment of majority and minority policy committees which would put major issues on a party basis. This last is something that Commerce Secretary Wallace suggested a while back, except that the Senate bill stipulates no reprisals if some rugged individualist refuses to hew to the party policy line.

In short, there is promise of better government in the Senate bill. If the House concurs, the result ought to win Congress a unanimous cheer. And that's a sweet sound that the legislators haven't heard in a long time.

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union of June 20, 1946]

STEPPING UP PROCEDURE

After a long period of discussion about streamlining Congress, the Senate finally evolves a bill aimed to step up procedure and bring more modern methods into the legislative department of the Government. In addition to voting the Members of both Houses a $5,000-a-year salary increase and retirement pensions payable under certain conditions, the Senators provide for revision of committees, for financial and technical experts to assist Members and for the registration and financial accountability of lobbyists. The measure fairly well covers the purpose intended and in all probability will be concurred in by the lower House

There may be some criticism of the salary boost, in view of our existing debt and already heavy governmental outlays. However, anyone who has had much contact with Congressmen knows that there is little left at the end of a regular term after the expenses of living in Washington are paid. It is true that Members enjoy fairly liberal allowances and mileage; but it also is true that they have to carry a pretty heavy financial burden, including the legitimate expenses of primary and election campaigns. As to the pension plan, its propriety is questionable. If Members of Congress feel entitled to retirement pay, there is no reason why governors, mayors, and other public officials, including State legislators, should not feel likewise.

Those who enact the laws of the land and expend the money of taxpayers certainly should have the benefit of the best available research and information; many State legislatures already have such service at their disposal. Capable advisers in all probability could save the Treasury a vast amount of money when appropriations are under consideration.

One thing "streamlining" cannot do, of course, is to give Congressmen sufficient moral stamina to vote their convictions when playing politics is more expedient. If this could be done it would be a good thing for both Congress and the country.

[From the Lewiston (Idaho) Tribune of June 13, 1946]

CONGRESSIONAL FACE LIFTING

A Congress fit to serve in an atomic age rather than that of the Clipper ships seems to be in store for the future if the House of Representatives accords the Government reorganization bill the same reception it received in the Senate on Tuesday. The bill was introduced to streamline Congress, reduce it from an overweight and ponderous growth to a sylphlike and vibrant body able to react to the demands of Government.

Outstanding in the provisions of the bill is the reduction in the number of Senate committees from 33 to 15 in order to lighten the load on lawmakers. The growth of committees has long bothered many solons, for they have been forced to spend more time in attending to committee business than on the floor of the Senate. Many Senators are on as many as 10 standing committees, which results in their being unable to efficiently perform their duties on any one of them. It has necessitated sketchy preparation and inadequate knowledge of the business at hand. With the number of committees reduced, Senators can, if they will, devote more time to carrying on the functions of Government. It is to be hoped that this reduction in the number of committees will see more Senators in the Chamber when that body is in session. Oftentimes important legislation has been acted upon with only an indifferent handful present.

Also of value will be that section of the bill which permits committees to retain technical and administrative assistants. More than once, committeemen have been ignorant of the facts behind the legislation they were considering never having been briefed on the subject. Assistants who are well versed in whatever phase of government the committee handles can keep Congressmen informed of all the aspects involved. This will remove the embarrassing episodes where Congressmen are made an object of humor by a witness who knows more about the subject than they do.

A pay hike for Congressmen is advisable, and the bill provided that $5,000 a year would be added to the $10,000 already received. Congressmen have been receiving $10,000 since 1925, but the manner of living in Washington, D. C., which might mildly be described as sumptuous, finds many of them unable to make both ends meet. This was perfectly agreeable in the days when, for example, the Senate was known as a rich man's club, but today when many Congressmen's sole income is that received for Government service they should not be forced to pinch pennies.

The optional pension plan whereby Congressmen could contribute 5 percent of their wages for 5 years and serve 6 years in Congress in order to be eligible is in line with the growing conviction that all persons should be given aid when they are no longer able to work.

Altogether the reorganization plan will give Congressmen a needed face lifting, restoring youthful vigor and removing the heavy paunch caused by an overindulgence in committees. It has met with some opposition, mainly from those Senators who would lose both face and rank as committee heads if the committees were removed, but those Congressmen who have any regard for doing a good job will accept it, realizing that it is something that has been needed for a long time.—T. W. C.

[From the Salt Lake City (Utah) Tribune of June 20, 1946]

FOR REVISING CONGRESSIONAL PROCEDURE, MAKE LA FOLLETTE'S BILL A LAW

Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin, has done at least one service to Congress and the country for which he deserves to be

remembered with gratitude. He conducted an investigation, submitted a report, introduced a bill and advocated its passage with such force and logic that a long-needed reform in legislative procedure in the direction of simplicity and efficiency should result.

He would keep pace with the growth of population and the attendant increase of public business, including problems and perplexities of which the founding fathers knew nothing and never lived long enough to learn about. Whether the overhauling contemplated comes through contrition or compulsion, the character and reputation of Congress will expand or dwindle accordingly.

The Senate has already approved the plan, the gentleman from the Badger State having secured a majority support before the southern Senators could organize a filibuster or effect a coalition. The vote was 49 to 16 in favor of the revision. As passed by the upper House, the bill embraces six major provisions, as follows:

1. Reduction of the number of Senate standing committees from 33 to 15, many memberships now being complimentary.

2. Increase in congressional salaries from $10,000 to $15,000 a year to enable men of moderate means to aspire and reject pressure.

3. Expansion of technical and administrative assistance to lawmakers. Each committee is to get four experts and each lawmaker a competent research aide.

4. Creation of a pension system which would allow a Member of Congress to contribute voluntarily to the Government's retirement fund.

5. Elimination of many routine tasks, such as a necessity for acting on each damage claim against the Government or on each proposal to build a bridge across a navigable stream.

6. Tighten fiscal controls by requiring Congress to go on record in favor of an increase in the national debt each time an estimated appropriation is above anticipated income for the next fiscal year.

As may be seen, this measure provides for simplification, expedition, and investigation of all legislation under consideration. Under the awkward system in vogue the legislator is often entangled in a complexity of committees, delayed in research or by numerous meetings, interfering with sessions which should be attended. Often there are not more than a half dozen Senators or a score of Representatives present when a bill is being discussed.

By supplying the several committees with experts to render technical and administrative assistance to 15 or 20 committeemen together, the saving in time would be enormous and opportunities for loafing would be minimized. The apparent obligation to press personal damage bills, to seek appropriations for the private convenience of constituents, to solicit Federal financial assistance while condemning bureaucracy, to fill the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with unspoken speeches, would no longer seem essential to official continuance of service.

Requiring Members of both Houses to answer the roll call, when appropriations are asked in excess of the estimated income for the following fiscal year, is desirable for two reasons: It will discourage indifference to the national debt and it will enable taxpayers to read the records of those who represent them. No frank and fair-minded legislator could object to that.

While the bill that passed the Senate omits reference to some important defects in the present system that need to be rectified, such as the selection of committee chairmen and personnel, as well as the enfeebling recognition of seniority rather than capability, there is enough proposed from which to make a start.

Representative ADOLPH J. SABATH, of Illinois, chairman of the House Rules Committee in charge of the bill, has asserted that he expects to take his time in considering its provisions. As he is past 80 years of age, he cannot expect to delay action indefinitely.

CITIZENSHIP—LETTER FROM ELIZABETH HARGRAVE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks an exceedingly interesting letter which I received from a young lady in the eighth grade of one of the Portland, Oreg., public schools, which illustrates, I think, and very interestingly, the breadth of educational work that is going on in our public schools. The letter deals with the subject of citizenship, and there is attached to it a statement of what the young eighth graders consider to be the "10 essentials of a really good American." I wish to be associated with the conclusions of those young citizens.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Portland, Oreg., April 17, 1946.

WAYNE L. MORSE,
United States Senator,
Eugene, Oreg.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Some extremely serious questions have arisen in our eighth-grade class discussion. You see, we have been studying a unit of work which teaches us better understanding of people of different races, nationalities, and religious faiths.

We have discovered that all human beings are very much alike. Difference in skin color is caused only by two chemicals just under the surface of the skin, melanin and carotene. All blood plasma is exactly the same. There is no such thing as Irish blood, Jewish blood, Negro blood, etc. The structure of the brain and central nervous system is exactly the same in all people. There is no Jewish race; it is the Jewish religion. Environment is what causes people to seem different.

We boys and girls have written what we think are 10 essentials of a really good American. I am enclosing a copy for you. We know that lots of people are prejudiced against people of other races and religious faiths because they do not know enough about them. We know many people do not feel as we do. We know all people are created equal and we think they should all have the same opportunities.

In our list of essentials of a really good American it is Nos. 3, 4, 5 that some people would not believe. That is our serious question. We wonder whether most people would think we were right in including them in our list. Each of us (there are 62 in our class) is writing to a different person somewhere in the United States to get opinions.

What is your opinion of the importance of attitudes of people toward those of different races, nationality backgrounds, and religious faiths as an essential qualification of a really good American?

We have a chart in our room with my name and your name on it. After it is a blue star which shows I sent the letter and a gold star will show I received an answer from you.

Please address me care of my homeroom teacher, Miss Ellen Dalquist. I am very grateful to you.

Sincerely yours,

ELIZABETH HARGRAVE.

GLEKCOE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, PORTLAND, OREG., SPRING TERM, 1945–46

The following were composed by 8B students after a study of intergroup understandings and a study of the rights guaranteed by the United States Constitution:

"TEN ESSENTIALS OF A REALLY GOOD AMERICAN

"1. A really good American shows reverence and love for God.

"2. A really good American is not unduly influenced by others but states his honest opinion according to what he thinks is right.

"3. A really good American does not dislike other Americans because of their race, nationality background, or religious faith.

"4. A really good American shows courtesy and respect toward all people regardless of race, nationality background, or religious faith.

"5. A really good American does everything possible to help his fellow Americans have equal opportunities to use their constitutional rights.

"6. A really good American is honest and trustworthy in all his dealings.

"7. A really good American, when saluting the flag, salutes it with full appreciation of the words he or she is speaking.

"8. A really good American is loyal to his country and his fellow men at all times.

"9. A really good American upholds and obeys the laws that concern him.

"10. A really good American uses his opportunities to the best advantage and does his work well to the best of his ability."

PARTICIPATION BY UNITED STATES IN THE UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION—STATEMENT BY WOMEN'S ACTION COMMITTEE FOR LASTING PEACE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement issued by the Women's Action Committee for Lasting Peace. This statement is in reply to a statement already appearing in the RECORD, which was inserted in the RECORD by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Women's Action Committee for Lasting Peace has one purpose; it is, to unite American women to work for full participation by the United States in the United Nations organization in order to build a world of peace and justice under law.

Its headquarters are in New York City but it is a national organization with State chairmen and congressional district chairmen in practically every State in the Union. It has over 20,000 members and the active cooperation of more than a dozen national women's organizations whose names appear on the stationery. It is the only women's organization working actively and exclusively for world peace through the United Nations organization. It supports measures in Congress aimed to achieve this result.

To secure its objective of furthering the United Nations organization and United States cooperation in it, the Women's Action Committee is concerned that Members of Congress shall be internationally minded. It keeps a record of the votes of Senators and Congressmen on international issues and it sends, on request, the records of these votes to its members. Seven Senators, who are running for reelection this fall, have consistently opposed international cooperation.

The Chicago Daily Tribune, May 1, 1946, attacked the Women's Action Committee in an editorial headed "Snobbery." The paper accused the organization of being made up

of eastern internationalists, consistent New Dealers, with knee-bending subservience to the empire, and viewing Stalin with worshipful regard. Said the Chicago Tribune, "This meddling organization follows the international line. It is difficult to believe that any middle westerners will fall victim to their snobbery."

The Senator from North Dakota, who is coming up for reelection, and who was one of two Senators who the Women's Action Committee is remembering voted against the United States' ratification of the United Nations Charter, read the editorial from the Tribune into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 3. He apparently did not know that this eastern organization has members in 13 of the North Dakota communities as well as in practically all congressional districts of the country.

It is only fair that a statement concerning the work of the Women's Action Committee for Lasting Peace should be inserted in the same columns.

ADMINISTRATION OF MILITARY JUSTICE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two articles and an editorial on the court-martial problem. One is entitled "Justice on a Drumhead," and is written by Maurice Rosenblatt. The second is an editorial entitled "Army Courts Martial," published in the San Francisco Chronicle of April 23, 1946; and the third is an article entitled "Revise Courts Martial," published in the Washington Post of January 1, 1946.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Nation magazine of April 27, 1946]

JUSTICE ON A DRUMHEAD

(By Maurice Rosenblatt)

A colonel sits stiffly before the American flag. To his right and left, tapering in rank, are half a dozen junior officers, immobility and coldness masking their faces. This is a general court martial. The trial judge advocate, whose sole duty in the Army is to prosecute, sits on one side acting both as prosecutor and adviser to the court. Opposite is the defense counsel, who has been hastily called from his duties as supply officer. The defendant—call him Sergeant Smith—is marched in under guard. He is bewildered by the rank and isn't sure whether he should salute or sit down. He has seen his attorney only once before, for a few minutes.

Charges are read, and the defense counsel waives the right to challenge any member of the court. A witness identifies Smith and is handed a typewritten sheet from which he reads his testimony. A judge asks if Smith was sober when the witness saw him in the jeep. Two other witnesses read statements. The judge advocate says that Smith is clearly guilty.

While the court deliberates he stands outside under guard. Things happened so fast he missed the moment when he was going to tell the court all about the jeep; that he'd just been released from the hospital and wanted to pick up ice for a party at the casual camp. He was going to tell about getting no mail for 3 months while his division pushed the enemy back several hundred miles; about being wounded. Carrying an automatic rifle made him a special target, though these people wouldn't understand that. All he wants is to get back to his outfit and not let his family know he was court martialed. He goes over the unuttered story.

Meanwhile the court reaches its decision. The junior officer votes first so that he will not be swayed by the judgment of his senior. It is a scrupulous provision, one of those punctilios of Army law which could have meaning if the substance of the whole procedure were fair. Finally Smith faces the judges. He has been found guilty of unlawfully using Government property. Before fixing sentence the court examines his record; it is clean, but the president of the court has privately reminded the others that the commanding general is tired of vehicle thefts, and that these fellows back from the front must realize they are still in the Army.

So Smith hears that he is to be broken to private, forfeit all pay and allowances, including months of combat pay which never caught up with him, be confined at hard labor for 2 years, and be dishonorably discharged. The whole trial took scarcely longer than a traffic case in night court.

Eight months after VJ-day more than 33,500 American soldiers are still confined in army prisons and rehabilitation centers. How did they get there?

Upon entering the army the soldier surrenders his constitutional rights and becomes subject to a code set forth in the Army's Manual for Courts Martial. This defines three types of court. The summary court tries minor violations and may fine or restrict an enlisted man. The special court, a board of three officers, decides cases of a more serious nature; these are presented by the trial judge advocate, and the defendant is entitled to counsel. The highest tribunal, the general court martial, has power to try officers as well as enlisted men. It can administer fines, sentence to hard labor and dishonorable discharge, and even impose the death penalty. The defendant may choose his own counsel, but few soldiers know that they may retain a civilian lawyer if they desire, and guardhouses provide no facilities for inmates to make arrangements for their defense. In practice the defense counsel is usually inexperienced and sometimes without legal training.

On paper Army justice is severe but fair. Actually it is frequently unfair and even brutal, less a system of justice than an arbitrary disciplinary code. Instead of preserving order and curbing crime it serves too frequently as an instrument of oppression by which officers fortify low-caliber leadership. Army justice has become the club which polices the caste system, punishing petty misconduct while ignoring the grossest malefaction. It creates bitterness, disillusionment, and helpless resentment among citizen-soldiers.

An ex-GI can talk about Army justice for hours, drawing on an inexhaustible stock of stories. Most of the cases cited here came to my notice during the 3 years I was attached to the Army's Department of Criminal Investigation. Army men who worked in the Judge Advocate or Provost Marshal section can match these with examples far more grim and lurid.

The first complaint against Army justice is that it operates on a double standard. Theoretically both officers and men are subject to the Articles of War listed in the Manual; in practice Army justice is administered only by officers and applied almost exclusively to enlisted men. In 1940 the Army conducted 16,391 courts martial; 17 of the men tried were officers. Only commissioned officers may serve on the court. Consequently the soldier is not tried by his equals but by representatives of a superior class whose status is maintained by disciplining the ranks. And a large proportion of trials arise from conflicts between officers and men.

An officer may violate an Article of War flagrantly and publicly, and not be punished. During the war a married lieutenant stationed at an east-coast town dated an 18-year-old girl. As he was taking her home he dragged her into an alley and tried to rape her. During the struggle the girl's arm was broken. The lieutenant had her arm set at the Army hospital, and the case was reported to military authorities. When questioned, the lieutenant admitted his part in the affair but laughed it all off, saying the girl was notoriously loose. The captain conducting the inquiry, a good friend of the lieutenant's, dropped the matter with the comment that lots of people broke their arms in winter falling on ice.

A contrast to the case of the laughing lieutenant is offered by that of the two enlisted men who picked up a WAC hitch-hiker in New Guinea. The woman spent several hours with the soldiers and later reported to the MP's that her watch had been stolen. Some two hours after reporting the theft, she casually remarked that she had also been raped. The two soldiers readily admitted having had relations with the woman but said she had been completely agreeable. At the trial no medical testimony was introduced to show physical evidence of rape. The court had only the word of the woman. But the two soldiers were sentenced to more than 10 years' hard labor. The character of the woman was not discussed at the trial, although she was awaiting return to the States because of mental incompetence.

An accused officer is rarely confined to a guardhouse before his trial. He can collect his evidence and muster his witnesses. If he is found guilty, the double standard still operates—"the higher the rank the milder the penalty." A reprimand to an officer is regarded as equivalent to a prison sentence for an enlisted man. Even traffic violations were treated differently during the war. At a camp where noncoms caught speeding were reduced to private and compelled to dig graves, officers were fined and reprimanded.

Combat soldiers who had engaged the enemy and survived by their own wits and intiative clashed with the garrison mentally behind the lines. At the front the use of vehicles, equipment, and food was dictated by necessity, and small heed was paid to vouchers or requisitions. When combat soldiers returned to a rear base, they wanted to blow off steam and have a good time—which generally involved liquor and a vehicle. Often when they were apprehended they were still suffering from combat fatigue, but the courts martial were likely to ignore that fact and to convict these men along with barracks thieves and deserters.

An over-conscientious soldier can get into considerable trouble inasmuch as the preservation of authority is of greater concern to the court than the merits of the case. A private at Fort Custer, Mich., while on "k. p." was directed by the mess sergeant to take meat which had been thrown into the garbage and place it in the refrigerator. The private refused because the meat was dirty. Two days later he was court-martialed for refusing to obey a lawful order. The only factor which the court considered was that the sergeant had issued an order which the private failed to obey. He was sentenced to 3 months' hard labor.

There is no habeas corpus in the Army. The Articles of War direct that no one may be unduly detained without being properly charged and tried, but the soldier, jailed before trial, has no way of enforcing his rights. Public opinion, the watchdog of civilian justice, plays virtually no part in the Army's system.

A Pennsylvania soldier, the father of eight, went home on furlough and overstayed his leave a week to be with his sick wife. On his way back to camp he was picked up in New Jersey. His records failed to arrive, and his trial was therefore put off. He told his story to six chaplains and inspectors without results. After he had been kept in confinement 3 months the allotment to his family was cut off on the ground that he was not earning his pay while in the guardhouse. That night he swallowed a disinfectant poison but was rushed to a hospital, where a stom-

ach pump saved his life. A few lines in his home-town paper about the attempted suicide worked wonders. He was brought to trial immediately and received a full acquittal, followed in a few weeks by an honorable discharge.

Who was to blame? Nobody wanted to take the responsibility for releasing the soldier under a system set up to confine, try, and convict. The safeguards of Anglo-Saxon justice were missing.

Guardhouse censorship makes it impossible for a prisoner to tell the outside world about mistreatment or violations of regulations by prison officers. In many though not all Army prisons, at home and abroad, a sadistic streak developed in the jailors. Men have been beaten and tortured, and fatalities have resulted from guardhouse brutality. The most notorious camp, at Lichfield, England, is currently having its crimson history of flogging and murder spread before the public in the testimony given at the trial of nine guards and two officers accused of cruelty. Yet the Lichfield commandant, Colonel Killian, was recommended for promotion by the War Department. Public protest led, instead, to his being charged with responsibility for the cruel treatment of prisoners—treatment which is alleged to have included beatings with rifle butts and rawhide.

Apologists for the Army's court-martial record point out that there are practically no instances of an innocent man being convicted or framed. That is true, but one must remember that Army regulations are so voluminous and contradictory that every officer and man in the service could be proved a transgressor if the authorities desired to press a charge. Too much depends upon the caprice of superior officers. Stealing a jeep might rate only a 6 months' sentence at one camp; at another it might bring 3 years and a dishonorable discharge.

At present the House Military Affairs Committee and an Army commission are investigating the court-martial system. Nothing will be accomplished, however, if they recommend only superficial reforms instead of basic changes. Any effort to revamp military justice runs head on against the congealed caste system, the officers' code, the inflexability of the military mind, and the sacred traditions of the service. But the fact remains that now is the time to obtain the needed changes, while the Army is courting public favor for appropriations and recruits. Veterans and taxpayers can demand certain reforms:

1. The protection of habeas corpus must be extended to the Army.

2. Military courts should include enlisted men as well as officers among the judges, in the trials of both officers and enlisted men.

3. The legal section of the Army, the Judge Advocate General's Department, should not be under the control of commanders of troops but should be made directly answerable to the Secretary of War, a civilian. This would end the present practice of using the legal powers of the Army as an administrative weapon to enforce personal policies. A civilian board of review should examine all court-martial sentences, and periodically inspect guardhouses and rehabilitation centers.

4. The Judge Advocate section, which today functions as a prosecutor's office, should provide also for defense. Access to civilian attorneys, now provided for in theory, should be facilitated.

5. The Courts Martial Manual should be revised; penalties for specific offenses should be standardized and a distinction made between breaches of Army discipline and criminal offenses. Also, a policy should be worked out regarding psychiatric evidence and medical treatment of sexual abnormals.

6. Officers in the Judge Advocate and Provost Marshal sections who have shown bias, cruelty, or negligence should be prosecuted.

7. Court-martial proceedings are not secret. If the press made a point of reporting courts martial like civil courts, the spotlight of publicity would do more than anything else to remedy current abuses.

Above all, the thousands of American soldiers still confined in Army guardhouses and Federal penitentiaries are entitled to a prompt review of their cases. A distinction should be made between those who committed actual crimes and those who overstepped one of the innumerable taboos and happened to be caught.

Remember, the man in uniform can do nothing about all this. It is up to veterans and civilians to right the wrongs of the past and set up a court-martial system which will be the cornerstone of a democratic army.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle of April 23, 1946]

ARMY COURTS MARTIAL

On the strength of statistics showing that Army courts condemned 142 men to death during the war while there were no executions in the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, Congressman J. LEROY JOHNSON of California appears justified in asking what's wrong with the Army court-martial system. Granting that the Army had twice the numerical strength of the naval services, and that opportunity for the two major types of capital crimes—murder and rape—was greater among the ground forces, these factors do not begin to explain the score of 142 of 0.

JOHNSON charges that the Army used its court-martial system to enforce discipline, rather than to administer impartial justice. The charge is serious enough to warrant the fullest investigation, and the investigation should have the whole-hearted support of the Army.

Wartime necessitates a considerable submergence of the individual rights for the welfare of the whole Nation, and several hundred thousand Americans willingly gave their lives on that basis. But it is doubtful if any young man perceived it his duty to face a firing squad of his own comrades for a crime which otherwise would not carry the death penalty so he might serve as an example to the service at large. That sort of stringency, far from promoting justice, would only kindle a deep and ominous resentment as an example of the kind of ruthless inhumanity we were trying to abolish from the earth.

If JOHNSON's charge is groundless the Army should refute it with all the vigor at its command. If the charge has basis in fact, the Army can serve its own best interests by overhauling its system of justice.

[From the Washington Post of January 1, 1946]

REVISE COURTS MARTIAL—COMMUNICATION POINTS UP DEFECTS

It is proper, I think, to point out at this time the existence of a type of duress practiced upon the courts in the Army court-martial system and, I assume, also existing in the Navy. Of course, any type of duress is prohibited by the manual for courts martial, but a method of exerting it upon a sworn court is nevertheless being practiced every day.

Courts are appointed by the commanding officer or general. The same officer refers charges for trial after he has examined them. Because of the fact that a report of an investigating officer is before him at the time of trial, too often commanding officers reach stern conclusions as to the guilt or innocence of the accused long before the trial is held. After the trial the same commanding officer must review and approve or disapprove the findings of the court and the sentence. To assist him in this work there is provided a staff judge advocate who is the judicial officer of the command.

One personal experience of the undersigned should be sufficient to prove the immediate need for a revamping of the entire system of courts martial and for reenactment of certain of the Articles of War.

The undersigned represented a staff sergeant in a general court martial in the military district of Washington about 2 years ago. It was a case in which the accused had been held without charges for a long period of time and had been held without trial for an even longer period, notwithstanding the fact that the Articles of War require that where a man is in arrest or confinement immediate steps will be taken to try him or he will be released.

Immediately after having been requested to act as defense counsel for the accused, the undersigned contacted the staff judge advocate of the military district of Washington in order to obtain a copy of the order appointing the court and certain necessary papers. In a discussion the judge advocate said to me the following: "Now, Ball, you have not got a chance in this case, and you might as well plead this man guilty and I will be satisfied with a sentence of 1 year."

This statement, mind you, was made by the highest judicial officer of the command, whose duty it was to review the record of the case at the trial from the standpoint of legality, competency, and sufficiency of evidence and the ever-present requirement of fair trial. The undersigned advised this officer quite frankly that he could abide by no such advice and that he considered it his duty to represent the man to the best of his ability on every issue at the trial.

The case was tried, a motion to release the accused on the ground that the Articles of War had not been complied with in that he had been held for months without trial was overruled, and the accused was sentenced to be reduced to the grade of private and to forfeit a certain amount of his pay per month for 6 months. You will note that the court did not sentence him to any confinement.

Upon review of this case the order, prepared by the staff judge advocate heretofore mentioned and issued by the commanding general of the military district of Washington included the following statement: "The sentence though grossly inadequate will be duly executed." This sentence in the order is an example of the type of duress exercised every day in court-martial procedure. The only possible effect of that statement was to admonish the court for not imposing a more severe punishment upon the accused.

It is such admonishment by the commanding officer of each member of the court in a published order which amounts to nothing short of duress upon the court and as a matter of fact in most cases results in more severe punishment in the next case heard by the court of equal guilt and circumstances.

Any system which allows courts, sworn to decide the case to their best ability according to the law and the evidence produced before them, to be ridiculed for their honest efforts is so contrary to the concept of democratic government which we in America have long since learned to love and appreciate that its very existence in its present state should be short lived and in its place should be a system of justice for each service separate and apart from command functions.

Only through the correction of the system, in order that the actual intent of Congress that every man should be given a fair and impartial trial be carried out, can real justice be provided. Otherwise the shocking injustices arising from courts martial in the past few years will continue to be a mockery of genuine judicial process.

FRANK J. BALL, JR.,
Major, AUP, Inactive.

ARLINGTON, VA., *December 26.*

Mr. MORSE. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement on naval

and military justice by Arthur J. Fruend, presiding at a session of the section of criminal law of the American Bar Association at Cincinnati, Ohio, on December 19, 1945.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The subject of our discussion this afternoon is Naval and Military Justice. It will be treated by two distinguished members of our armed forces and followed by a discussion of experts. It is our hope that the discussion period will also have the participation of all persons here interested.

While a great variety of subjects have been studied at this American Bar Association meeting, it is likely that none is of greater importance or of greater public interest than the one assigned to us. The system of naval and military justice is under severe public scrutiny. Fire at our systems of courts martial has been directed by returning veterans, by our press, and in the Halls of Congress. It is obvious that this should be so.

The Articles of War and our courts martial procedure are deeply rooted in our Military and Naval Establishments. The summary and direct methods, while efficient in a mechanical sense, have but small comparison to the administration of justice administered in our civilian criminal courts. It is to be expected that contrasts should be observed by returning veterans and the parents and friends of men convicted by courts martial.

Complaint is made that officers untrained in the determination of facts and the fixing of punishment constitute the personnel of courts martial; that members of the court are frequently under domination of their superior officers; that untrained persons are often assigned to try and defend the accused and that defense counsel are themselves often under the fear of reprisal by a superior officer if complete zeal is given in such defense; that punishment inflicted is in a large number of instances by civilian or humanitarian standards out of all proportion to the nature of the offense or the character of the offender.

On the other hand, a naval or military force cannot perform its functions without the highest standards of discipline. It is said that the present system of courts martial is essential to the maintenance of that discipline.

It is not for me as chairman to discuss the merits of this extremely important controversy. But it is my hope that a frank and sincere consideration of the problem be given. We should, like Janus, look backward and forward. Looking backward, if injustices have been done, we should use our efforts to correct them. If the system is good, it can withstand the most careful and meticulous scrutiny. If the system needs to be changed, we should advise what changes are necessary. And to look forward, we should realize that we are going to have a large Naval and Military Establishment in this country for years to come. Many believe that we will have compulsory peacetime military service. If that be so, then it is all the more important that our system of naval and military justice to regulate the lives of hundreds of thousands of young men who will constitute a large part of our Naval and Military Establishment, be governed by as perfect a system of justice as the mind and heart of man can devise.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at this late hour I do not intend to make an extended statement on the subject of military justice; but before the Senate adjourns for the summer I intend to make further remarks upon it.

At this time I wish to point out that many of us who have been interested in the two court-martial resolutions which have been pending for many months in the Senate believe that it would be very unfortunate for the Senate to adjourn without passing one of the resolutions calling for a Senate investigation of the court-martial systems of the Army and Navy. I think we have been exceedingly patient. The so-called McCarran resolution was submitted some months ago, subsequent to the resolution which I submitted on the same subject.

Suffice it to say at this time that I do not think we have any right, as representatives of the people of the United States, to adjourn for a long recess—supposedly until next January—and permit many so-called military and naval prisoners to languish in military and naval prisons as the result of the miscarriage of military justice during this war. It seems to me that we have a duty to put a Senate committee to work during the summer and next fall, to make a thorough investigation and survey of military and naval justice.

I wish to say to the Secretary of War, Mr. Patterson, that he does not impress me one iota by his defenses recently published in the press in regard to military justice. I am not at all impressed by the attempts on the part of the War Department and the Navy Department to investigate themselves. I repeat what I have previously said. It is the clear public duty of Members of the Senate to pass either the McCarran resolution or the Morse resolution, calling for an investigation of military and naval justice. I do not know how much longer we are going to tolerate the gross injustices which developed during the war on the part of the War Department and the Navy Department, with huge numbers of our men in the service suffering from such injustices.

I close by repeating what I previously stated. Let Mr. Patterson, the Secretary of War, produce a rebuttal to it. I have yet to talk with a single lawyer who served in the armed forces of the United States Army or Navy who had not said to me that it is of the utmost importance, in the name of justice, that either the McCarran resolution or the Morse resolution be passed by the Senate.

Thus once again I raise my voice on the floor of the Senate. I ask the Senate to recognize the importance of these pending resolutions and that we serve notice on the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War by action, demonstrated by a majority vote for one of the resolutions, that the Senate intends to analyze from top to bottom the military justice practices of the Army and Navy.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to say that the Mead committee has, in a small way, looked into the question of military justice and court martial. The question arose in connection with an investigation in Hawaii, and one in Puerto Rico. I am of the opinion that a thorough investigation of the entire procedure of military justice during the war should be made. I feel that the problem calls for study. I believe that the Senate is the proper body to look into this question. Enough was disclosed during the two investigations to which I have referred to indicate that this subject is important in connection with our national defense. I believe that an overall, thorough investigation of military justice during the war should be made.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Michigan for the support which he is giving me in this fight. I think the RECORD will show that I have yet to raise my voice in connection with this matter without having the support of the Senator from Michigan, as well as the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] who, as Members of this body know, is himself a veteran of this war and is thoroughly familiar with the importance of the fight which I am trying to make in my demands for an investigation.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock a. m. on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, July 1, 1946, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 29 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

William T. Mahoney to be United States marshal for division No. 1, district of Alaska. (Mr. Mahoney is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires July 7, 1946.)

Stanley J. Nichols, of Alaska, to be United States marshal for division No. 4, district of Alaska, vice Joseph A. McDonald, whose term will expire July 7, 1946.

Thomas P. O'Donovan, of Illinois, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Illinois, vice William H. McDonnell, resigned.

Eugene J. Smith, of New York, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of New York, vice Spencer C. Young, resigned.

Neale D. Murphy, of Rhode Island, to be United States marshal for the district of Rhode Island. (Mr. Murphy is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires July 3, 1946.)

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Eula E. Hamilton, Woodstock, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

ARIZONA

James Cohen Garrett, Eloy, Ariz., in place of R. E. Hamilton, transferred.

CALIFORNIA

Sylvia S. Richardson, Highway Highlands, Calif., in place of A. L. Routson, resigned.

Roscoe J. King, Indio, Calif., in place of Margaret Allen, retired.

Arthur Patterson, Lincoln Acres, Calif., in place of L. P. Comerford, removed.

COLORADO

J. Max Rush, Otis, Colo., in place of M. M. Reed, deceased.

FLORIDA

Lessie L. McMullen, Lee, Fla., in place of Vesta Blanton, removed.

GEORGIA

John W. Ray, Dalton, Ga., in place of W. M. Denton, retired.

ILLINOIS

Eleanore A. Morley, Good Hope, Ill., in place of J. M. Hickman, deceased.

IOWA

Lucille V. Gittinger, Eldon, Iowa, in place of J. A. Hollen, removed.

MARYLAND

Frank Scott Bradley, Federalsburg, Md., in place of R. W. Noble, deceased.

MISSOURI

Raymond H. Schell, Augusta, Mo., in place of Calvin Clay, resigned

Grace N. Davis, Desloge, Mo., in place of E. B. Newman, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

Norma E. Emmans, Ledgewood, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NEW YORK

Marian Chadderdon, Acra, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Wynford B. Bailey, Lexington, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Sarah A. Wilcox, Wellsburg, N. Y., in place of C. M. Stanton, removed.

NORTH DAKOTA

Arthur J. DeKrey, Pettibone, N. Dak., in place of H. B. Pruitt, designed.

OHIO

Lester Bishop, Johnstown, Ohio, in place of O. I. Foster, resigned.

John Merle Gibson, Savannah, Ohio, in place of A. M. Gibson, retired.

Joseph D. Ryan, Willoughby, Ohio, in place of M. A. Delsantro, removed.

PENNSYLVANIA

Thelma B. Kelley, Brier Hill, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Charles E. Ongley, Grand Valley, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Clara M. Baker, Penllyn, Pa., in place of O. S. Rosenberger, retired.

Thomas Mark Shockey, Rouzerville, Pa., in place of W. N. Rowe, resigned.

TENNESSEE

Levie B. Thomas, Pleasant Shade, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

TEXAS

Oneta M. Fersch, Wink, Tex., in place of P. E. Jette, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Juanita Collins, North Matewan, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 29 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

SUPREME COURT, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Louis LeBaron, to be associate justice of the Supreme Court, Territory of Hawaii.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Hon. Bunk Gardner to be United States district judge of the Canal Zone.

Hon. George B. Harris, to be United States district judge for the northern district of California.

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY

The nominations of Charles E. Briner et al., officers, for appointment in the United States Navy, which were received by the Senate on June 25, 1946, and which appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Tuesday, June 25, 1946, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Charles E. Briner on page 7464 and ending with the name of Morris W. Woods, ending on page 7467.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, JUNE 29, 1946

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou infinite spirit of life, Thou hast not set a limit to the richness of love, to the power of self-sacrifice, nor to the sublimity of purity. O teach us the beauty and the simplicity of the Christian life apart from creeds and dogmas, that in faith we may walk with Thee, happy in the assurance of a wise fellowship of service. While days are difficult and discipline is hard, do Thou open our minds for the reception of Thy guiding wisdom and direct us with Thy nourishment. In affliction shield us, endowed with Thy plenteous gifts, that our endeavors may be in harmony with Thy will and our strength be able to bear it. Do Thou bless and enrich the church universal, and let the glory of the Lord be established in the souls of all the nations. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6516. An act to increase the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 6682. An act to amend sections 81, 82, and 83, and to repeal section 84 of chapter IX of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5933. An act to authorize and direct the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to establish and operate in the public schools and other suitable locations a system of nurseries and nursery schools for day care of school-age and under-school-age children, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2234. An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, to provide for unemployment compensation in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5990) entitled "An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71 to the foregoing bill.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment numbered 1 to said bill, disagreed to by the House, asks a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HOEY, Mr. BALL, Mr. WILLIS, and Mr. FERGUSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6428. An act making appropriations for the Coast Guard, Treasury Department, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. WHITE, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. REED conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6837. An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. REED to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1654) entitled "An act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes."

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6496) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement on the part of the managers be read in lieu of the report.